

## FOREWORD

Much of this book was written over 25 years ago. Then I wrote a work (for Samizdat, of course), in anticipation of an impending crisis, dedicated to the situation in the Soviet Union at that time (ie, before "perestroika"). In it, I spoke about some of the tendencies that emerged at that time, which, in my opinion, were dangerous for the future of the country. Moreover, he could not help but pay attention to the exceptional, conspicuous participation that Jewish publicists and writers took in the development of these tendencies. In the course of discussing all the issues under consideration, some historical parallels came to my mind, which I set out. Gradually it became noticeable that the abundance of such historical excursions obscures the main idea of the work. A friend of mine, now deceased, advised me to collect all historical excursions into one Appendix to work. The thought seemed reasonable to me and I began to write such an Application. Along the way, I got acquainted with works that were new to me and the thoughts and facts extracted from them were also included in the Appendix. As a result, a text appeared, or even two (one was specially devoted to Russian history), together exceeding the original work. As an "Application" they have already lost their meaning and then did not affect the work in any way. The work appeared in Samizdat under the title "Russophobia" and began to live its own life, while the "historical" text remained in the "box". together exceeded the original work. As an "Application" they have already lost their meaning and then did not affect the work in any way. The work appeared in Samizdat under the title "Russophobia" and began to live its own life, while the "historical" text remained in the "box". together exceeded the original work. As an "Application" they have already lost their meaning and then did not affect the work in any way. The work appeared in Samizdat under the title "Russophobia" and began to live its own life, while the "historical" text remained in the "box".

Many years have passed since then. The considerations I expressed in the work published after that and in print, it seems to me, were fully confirmed - by no means did they please me at all. The trends that I observed as barely noticeable cracks in the monolith of the then state have now turned into abysses and landslides that almost destroyed the country. And, in particular, the phenomenon of obvious overactive participation of some Jewish movements in this work of destruction arose again.

Now again, as 25 years ago, there is a need to comprehend the events that have taken place. We live in a completely new situation, created by the dramatic changes of the last 12-15 years. But these changes also provide abundant material for thought, even a completely new point of view, from the perspective of which we can look at the whole story.

The present work contains both the old text, more than 25 years old (sometimes revised), and new observations and considerations. The content of the work, it seems to me, is revealed by its title. This is a discourse on a topic that, sometimes very vaguely, is called the "Jewish question".

I want to immediately define my position: my incentive in writing this work was empathy with the history of my own people and, even more so, discussion of its possible future. This determines the orientation of the work: the history of relations between Jews and other peoples is useful as a collection of examples for understanding Russian - Jewish relations. It seems improbable to me that it is possible to discuss such a question, distracted from one's own nationality, as if from above, just as in Homer Zeus impartially weighs fate, "share", Hector and Achilles on the scales. To do this, you need to be an immortal Thunderbolt. But a humanly biased point of view does not imply bias, moreover, hostility: if only because anger is a bad advisor. The purpose of the work is to give some facts and considerations,

But first, of course, it is necessary to discuss whether there is such a "question", is there a reasonable subject for thought. This is where the work begins.

S.P. Demushkin provided invaluable assistance in preparing the manuscript. Without his assistance, the book would certainly not have seen the light of day.

I am deeply grateful to everyone who helped me get the literature I need for a book, both in our country and abroad.

My heartfelt thanks to those who were able to read the manuscript and make remarks that were extremely useful to me.

Author.

## Chapter 1. Is there a "Jewish question"?

Jews have played a fateful role in the history of our country more than once: in the revolutionary movement, economy and press before the 1917 revolution; in the apparatus of power: the party, the Cheka-OGPU-NKVD, the leadership of the main people's commissariats - after the revolution. Their role is colossal in modern life: in the party, the apparatus of propaganda and culture, in shaping the attitude of the West towards the USSR, in managing public opinion. And no doubt their influence will be no less in the foreseeable future. (15 years after this text was written, the events of the late 1980s and 1990s, it seems to me, fully confirmed this idea. For more details, see Chapter 15).

It would seem that independent thought in our country should constantly return to this amazing and important phenomenon. For many reasons, however, this did not happen - and not only now, it was so in the past. Among the few exceptions, Dostoevsky, who generally noticed much that was still hidden from others, devoted several deep articles to the "Jewish question" more than a hundred years ago. He started out like this:

*Oh, do not think that I am really planning to raise the "Jewish question". I wrote this title as a joke. I am unable to raise such a magnitude question as the position of the Jew in Russia and the position of Russia, which has three million Jews among its sons. This question is not in my size.*

Of course, these words are not an expression of the author's coquetry: obviously, Dostoevsky felt that modernity had not yet provided him with the necessary facts or points of view to get closer to understanding the true roots of the issue he raised (there are such hints in his articles). The past century has provided us with a host of new facts on this topic. I am afraid, however, that the situation since Dostoevsky's time has not become more favorable: because, in addition to facts, time has brought with it many myths, taboos, and outright lies - and all this barricaded the very approaches to the "Jewish question". So in this work, too, I do not set myself the goal of "raising the Jewish question" - all the more it is "not in my size." But I would like to try to at least start a discussion of it in the light of our vast experience, at least help clear the way to understanding

First of all, we are blocked by the statement that this issue should not be discussed at all. "It is not humane to operate with such an abstraction as the "Jewish question "or" Jewishness "- this ignores the human individuality, some people are held responsible for the actions of others. hear often. However, the "discussion" of any social or historical phenomenon is impossible without the introduction of some general categories: states, nations, estates. This is a very important component of social or historical analysis and in other cases, no objection is raised. Why can we talk about the influence that the Huguenots who emigrated from France had on the development of capitalism in Germany, but is it immoral to raise the question of a similar Jewish influence? It is possible to draw attention to the role played by the multinational character of Russia in the Russian revolution, but "not intelligently" interested in what, in particular, was the

role of the Jews? It is hardly possible to answer such questions, unless it is accepted that different standards should be applied to Jews and other peoples. You just need to keep in mind that we are operating with some abstraction and not absolutize it.

At first glance, another objection looks more convincing - the assertion that there is no question at all, that the concept of "Jew" or "Jewish people" is an empty abstraction that does not correspond to any reality. So, the modern (XX century) French philosopher Raymond Aron asks: what is common between Yemeni and American Jews, even if both live in Israel? Much earlier, Stalin asked the same question: what is common between the Caucasian and American Jews? But the answer, it turns out, is well known to many Jews - authors who speak from the standpoint of Jewish nationalism. Here is the opinion of the most prominent leader of Jewish nationalism in the 19th century, Gertz, who wrote the (first complete) 11-volume History of the Jewish People. By the middle of the 19th century, he writes in the last volume of this History, some Jewish nationalists began to complain that under the influence of contacts with European culture, as a result of giving them equal rights, the Jews began to lose their over-state cohesion. But in 1840 in Syria, in Damascus, a case arose on charges of several Jews in the ritual murder of a Catholic monk. And immediately it was discovered:

*what a wonderful interconnection indissolubly unites the members of the Jewish world, how still strong are the bonds invisibly, unconsciously pulling them together, how the very first threat to Jewry makes the hearts of all Jews on the globe beat in a patriotic outburst: of any party sentiment, a free-thinker reformer, just like an unyielding orthodox, a statesman who apparently departed from Jewry in the same way as a scribe immersed in Kabbalah and Talmud, in cheerful France the same way as in brooding Asia.*

At the head of the movement for the release of the Jews arrested in Damascus were: the French politician Adolphe Cremieux and the living in England Baron Nathaniel Rothschild and Sir Moses Montefiore. They went to Turkey, secured the release of the detained Jews and even forced them to remove the tomb of the murdered monk from the church of the Capuchin monastery. It would seem, indeed, what do Baron Rothschild and Sir Montefiore have in common with the Syrian Jews? But some kind of "indissoluble connection" exists. And it has not existed since the last century. Here is evidence dating back to antiquity (it belongs to the famous historian Mommsen).

*How numerous even in Rome the Jewish population was even before Caesar, and how steadfastly the Jews were already at that time in the tribal relation, indicates to us the remark of one of the modern writers - that it is dangerous for a governor to interfere too much in the affairs of the Jews of his province, since upon his return in Rome he will have to be booed by the metropolitan rabble.*

This is how - as a single living organism, immediately reacting to painful irritation of any part of it - Jewry passes through all history, right up to the present day. Any question that is acute for Jewry is immediately picked up by the press of the whole world - as was the case, for example, with the "Dreyfus Case", "The Beilis Case" or "The Doctors'

Case". Since the beginning of this (i.e., XX) century, the negotiations of the Russian government on loans in England, France, America came up against the resistance of Jewish banking houses, which made it a condition to change the position of Jews in Russia. That is, the interests of Russian Jews were, for example, for the English Rothschilds more important than their own financial interests! The case came to an organized international boycott, and banks that tried to violate it were subjected to pressure and punishment. President Taft in 1911 entry of Jews. A symmetrical situation, when a trade agreement was not concluded due to the fact that Jews were not allowed to leave the USSR, developed before our eyes (the Jackson-Vanik law).

And more recently, one could read in newspapers or hear on the radio about demonstrations and petitions of, say, Belgian Jews in defense of, in their opinion, oppressed Soviet Jews. After all, this is amazing: if they had met - a Soviet Jew and his European defender, they most likely could not even explain themselves. What connects them? Not the language, not the territory or love for the native landscape, not the state, not the culture, now, as a rule, not even a religion. Apparently, the Jews themselves often only feel this power that binds them, but cannot give it a rational explanation. For example, in an article published in a contemporary magazine published in Russian in Israel, the author, an American Jew, writes:

*For most American Jews who now form the top of the American middle class, what sets them apart as Jews is some kind of sense of closeness (...). Perhaps the most accurate way would be to say that they "feel something like that" ... This "something like that" is the basis of their feelings of Jewishness. Such a small "something ..." (...). And this, it turns out, is a very specific thing - to be singled out, to belong to this group. So specific that people do not want to give the feeling of this belonging and separation, do not want to "exchange" it for anything else.*

And Freud, referring to the modern "rebel", said: "If they asked him what is Jewish in you, when you left everything that you had in common with your compatriots, he would answer: there is still a lot, probably the most important thing."

These statements, to which I drew attention a long time ago, are confirmed by others, later. For example, a publicist living in Germany, a representative of the "third wave" of emigration, S. Margolina writes:

*The Jew is not a fantastic invention. His self-awareness begins with a sense of "differentness." It is rooted in the tradition of being chosen, which, having lost its religious immediacy, is realized in the secular form of superiority and narcissism.*

Another objection is often raised here: if to some extent there is a self-consciousness of the Jews of the whole world as a whole, then its reason lies not in the Jews, but in the situation in which they find themselves - this is a common property of scattered and persecuted peoples. Note that this objection still recognizes the existence of the phenomenon that we are discussing, offering only its explanation... But the explanation

does not seem convincing either. It is a reflection of the general concept, according to which the activity of an organism, a person, a society is directed not by internal stimuli, but by the influence of the environment. This concept is borrowed from biology (Darwinism, behaviorism), but even there it seems to cease to be popular. In the case of interest to us, the question, one might say, is available for experimental verification, since besides the Jews there were so many peoples who were losing their state! - but the fate of all of them was completely different from that of the Jews. The state of the Vandals was destroyed by Byzantium, and no one else heard anything about the vandals, and the Jewish state was destroyed by Assyria, Babylon, and Rome, but in the end they collapsed, and the Jews still exist! The Russian revolution poured out numerous emigration abroad, for the most part, inflamed with patriotic feelings, striving with all her might to keep in touch with Russia - and already the grandchildren of the emigrants barely speak Russian and have a sentimental interest in Russia at best; and emigration did not have any influence on the political life of the world or those countries where it lived. America provides a striking example. Almost all of its inhabitants in one generation or another are emigrants, but, with one single exception, their national interests have very little impact on US policy. There are many Germans there, but this did not stop America from fighting against Germany in the last two wars. But the interests of the Jewish part of the US population simply dominate politics: they sacrifice both trade deals with the USSR and the problem of supplying oil from the Middle East. We will give other examples below. striving with all her might to maintain ties with Russia - and already the grandchildren of the emigrants barely speak Russian and have a sentimental interest in Russia at best; and emigration did not have any influence on the political life of the world or those countries where it lived. America provides a striking example. Almost all of its inhabitants in one generation or another are emigrants, but, with one single exception, their national interests have very little impact on US policy. There are many Germans there, but this did not stop America from fighting against Germany in the last two wars. But the interests of the Jewish part of the US population simply dominate politics: they sacrifice both trade deals with the USSR and the problem of supplying oil from the Middle East. We will give other examples below. striving with all her might to maintain ties with Russia - and already the grandchildren of the emigrants barely speak Russian and have a sentimental interest in Russia at best; and emigration did not have any influence on the political life of the world or those countries where it lived. America provides a striking example. Almost all of its inhabitants in one generation or another are emigrants, but, with one single exception, their national interests have very little impact on US policy. There are many Germans there, but this did not stop America from fighting against Germany in the last two wars. But the interests of the Jewish part of the US population simply dominate politics: they sacrifice both trade deals with the USSR and the problem of supplying oil from the Middle East. We will give other examples below. where she lived, emigration had nothing to do with it. America provides a striking example. Almost all of its inhabitants in one generation or another are emigrants, but, with one single exception, their national interests have very little impact on US policy. There are many Germans there, but this did not stop America from fighting against Germany in the last two wars. But the interests of the Jewish part of the US population simply dominate politics: they sacrifice both trade deals with the USSR and the problem of supplying oil from the

Middle East. We will give other examples below. where she lived, emigration had nothing to do with it. America provides a striking example. Almost all of its inhabitants in one generation or another are emigrants, but, with one single exception, their national interests have very little impact on US policy. There are many Germans there, but this did not stop America from fighting against Germany in the last two wars. But the interests of the Jewish part of the US population simply dominate politics: they sacrifice both trade deals with the USSR and the problem of supplying oil from the Middle East. We will give other examples below. but that did not stop America from fighting against Germany in the last two wars. But the interests of the Jewish part of the US population simply dominate politics: they sacrifice both trade deals with the USSR and the problem of supplying oil from the Middle East. We will give other examples below. but that did not stop America from fighting against Germany in the last two wars. But the interests of the Jewish part of the US population simply dominate politics: they sacrifice both trade deals with the USSR and the problem of supplying oil from the Middle East. We will give other examples below.

Many have paid attention to this striking phenomenon. For example, M.O. Gershenzon wrote:

*The history of the Jews (....) is too strange in its striking dissimilarity with the history of other peoples ...*

He attracts this image:

*Compared to most plants attached to a place, a plant wandering in the sea is abnormal ... It (Jewishness - I.Sh.) is similar to those plants wandering in the sea, whose roots do not grow into the bottom.*

*Finally, we must admit that the life of mankind is not governed by trivial logic, that it has general rules, but there are exceptions to them, and that the fate of the Jews is one example of this. Such recognition will be invaluable in that it warns against belief in primitive, trivial solutions: for example, that the Jewish question, which has been a mystery to mankind for 30 centuries, will be resolved as a result of assimilation or the issuance of special laws regulating the position of the Jews.*

The unwillingness to part with simple, familiar views is quite understandable. So I do not want to abandon the "reasonable", "logical" point of view: Jews - de - people like others; only extreme Jewish nationalists, and extreme haters of Jews, represent them (converging in their extreme) either as messengers from heaven or as a devil; of course, they are people with a difficult history, surprisingly united, but put others in the same conditions - and the result would be the same. Rejecting this point of view, you find yourself, as it seems, in the realm of some kind of fantasies, mysticism (and it's a shame even to recognize for others some special, unique features). The author himself knows how difficult it is to part with such a view, how long you sacrifice both logic and facts for this - until you realize quite clearly that you are struggling with the

evidence. Not only are the Jews not the same people as everyone else, but there are no intermediate steps between them and other nations, there is some kind of disruption of continuity. And when other nations find themselves in a situation similar to that in which the Jews are, this only emphasizes their difference. There is no denying the existence of this force, which Gertz called the "miraculous relationship" that unites the Jews of the world: too often and too powerfully it affects the life of mankind. The fact that neither we, nor, probably, the Jews themselves, understand by what factors this force acts, does not call into question its existence: the physicist observing some phenomenon will not deny it just because there is no can explain it. Further we will proceed from this point of view, i.e. the existence of a social force acting as a whole, which can be called "Jewish influence in the world" or "Jewry". We will not try to analyze the internal stimuli driving this force and directing it in one direction or another. We will not even ask ourselves the question of whether all Jews or only a few are subject to the action of this force: those who submit to it form "Jewry". We will be interested in what this force reacts to, how its point of application changes. Only in this sense will we talk about its "goals".

The existence of this force actually constitutes the "Jewish question". Throughout the work, we will try to indicate its manifestations in a variety of historical situations - from hoary antiquity to the present day. But what, strictly speaking, is the "question"? - why is the presence of this force (if we assume that our arguments proving that it exists are convincing) - why is this fact important, perceived as a question addressed to us on behalf of History? The reason, apparently, is that this power most often manifests itself when some traditional ways of life collapse - and is a factor contributing to their radical and ruthless destruction. The whole history demonstrates, as it were, the coexistence of two difficult to combine, dissimilar entities. Coexistence, resulting in conflicts in which one or the other side suffers. Massacre, produced by the Cossacks of Khmelnytsky in the Jewish town of Nemiroff, as if resurrected in the massacre of Arabs in the Palestinian village of Deir Yassin, in the refugee camps of Shabra and Satila in Lebanon. Yes, examples run through the whole history, we will meet them in many and in this work. In conflict situations of this magnitude, the search for the "culprit" is hardly productive. Awareness of the situation itself is more important. It is the uniqueness and uncommonness of the history of Jewry that explains the fact that it has so constantly attracted human thought to itself. Perceived as a Riddle.

As we have already said, the power of interest to us manifests itself on a very large segment of History. Therefore, in order to notice some of its features, it is necessary to consider it throughout this entire interval. Here we will give a very brief description of it, the most concise description of it for the historical period when it can be observed. This is a preparatory work for those who in the future will try to more deeply comprehend its impact on the fate of our people or all of humanity, as it were, a historical background against which this problem, it seems to me, should be considered.

We are confronted here with an area to which an enormous literature is devoted. We, in this work, will rely only on a small part of these sources. It is not only the obvious reason that plays a role here - the inability of the author to cover the entire literature (often the inability to get sources that seem interesting). More importantly, this literature for the



most part is extremely tendentious and causes little credibility. Those objections to the discussion of the "Jewish question", which were given at the beginning of the paragraph, are not just ingrained stereotypes of thinking - they are almost dogmas of a certain worldview and disobedience to them causes irrational rage. The strength of the glowing feelings here is shown by a range of arguments that go far beyond the scope of intellectual discussion. Suffice it to remind that now, in a number of Western countries, even a public expression of doubt about the figure of 6 million Jews who died at the hands of the Nazis is punishable by imprisonment. Under this article, a number of persons were punished - some served their term, others are hiding, and still others are dismissed without hope of finding a job and without the right to a pension. Yes, and I myself, during the period of just flourishing freedom and liberalism in our country, only tried to touch on the "issue" in print, immediately met with a public demand that the KGB should take up my works (then it was still called that). And this is on the part of a publicist who proclaimed dedication to democracy! Then I discovered for the first time that one does not contradict the other. And this generates caution in many, self-censorship - that very internal editor, whom everyone remembers from the times of the communist system. killed at the hands of the Nazis - a criminal offense of imprisonment. Under this article, a number of persons were punished - some served their term, others are hiding, and still others are dismissed without hope of finding a job and without the right to a pension. Yes, and I myself, during the period of just flourishing freedom and liberalism in our country, only tried to touch on the "issue" in print, immediately met with a public demand that the KGB should take up my works (then it was still called that). And this is on the part of a publicist who proclaimed dedication to democracy! Then I discovered for the first time that one does not contradict the other. And this generates caution in many, self-censorship - that very internal editor, whom everyone remembers from the times of the communist system. killed at the hands of the Nazis - a criminal offense of imprisonment. Under this article, a number of persons were punished - some served their term, others are hiding, and still others are dismissed without hope of finding a job and without the right to a pension. Yes, and I myself, during the period of just flourishing freedom and liberalism in our country, only tried to touch on the "issue" in print, immediately met with a public demand that the KGB should take up my works (then it was still called that). And this is on the part of a publicist who proclaimed dedication to democracy! Then I discovered for the first time that one does not contradict the other. And this generates caution in many, self-censorship - that very internal editor, whom everyone remembers from the times of the communist system. still others are dismissed without hope of finding a job and without the right to retire. Yes, and I myself, during the period of just flourishing freedom and liberalism in our country, only tried to touch on the "issue" in print, immediately met with a public demand that the KGB should take up my works (then it was still called that). And this is on the part of a publicist who proclaimed dedication to democracy! Then I discovered for the first time that one does not contradict the other. And this generates caution in many, self-censorship - that very internal editor, whom everyone remembers from the times of the communist system. still others are dismissed without hope of finding a job and without the right to retire. Yes, and I myself, during the period of just flourishing freedom and liberalism in our country, only tried to touch on the "issue" in print, immediately met with a public demand that the KGB should

take up my works (then it was still called that). And this is on the part of a publicist who proclaimed dedication to democracy! Then I discovered for the first time that one does not contradict the other. And this generates caution in many, self-censorship - that very internal editor, whom everyone remembers from the times of the communist system. so that the KGB would take over my works (then it was still called that way). And this is on the part of a publicist who proclaimed dedication to democracy! Then I discovered for the first time that one does not contradict the other. And this generates caution in many, self-censorship - that very internal editor, whom everyone remembers from the times of the communist system. so that the KGB would take over my works (then it was still called that way). And this is on the part of a publicist who proclaimed dedication to democracy! Then I discovered for the first time that one does not contradict the other. And this generates caution in many, self-censorship - that very internal editor, whom everyone remembers from the times of the communist system.

Naturally, such a biased and one-sided coverage of an important issue caused, as a reaction, the appearance of many works of the opposite direction, just as tendentious. In particular, over the past decade - in our country. And they are full of thoughts or communicated facts that, precisely because of the extreme polemical style of the work, inspire doubt. Here I will refer to the last, apparently, work of V.V. Kozhinov, published during his lifetime. It is published in the "Holy Rus" magazine published in Minsk and is devoted to the analysis of the book "War according to the laws of meanness", which was also recently published in Minsk. As stated in Kozhinov's article, the book is mainly devoted to the "Jewish question", but it lumps together a question, as he says, "extremely significant and extremely acute." and the many preconceived notions, unverified rumors and myths that have formed around him. Among them Kozhinov includes the view inspired by the book that "all the evil in the world comes only from Jews alone," and also that "*all* Jews *all* trustworthy - but "trustworthy" on whose side? From what point of view?

And yet it seems to me that there are a number of signs that make it possible to select sources (or certain parts of them) that can be trusted, at least to some extent. I will list these symptoms. Throughout the work, I will use just such sources.

Firstly, these are those that can be called "primary sources". For example, the Old Testament. His translations, with the exception of some details, apparently do not cause doubts, so that by him one can fairly reliably judge the spirit of Judaism. The Talmud and various commentaries to it (for example, "Shulchan Aruch") can be attributed to the same group of sources. The question of which translations to use here is more complicated, we will return to it in our place.

Another group of sources is the work of Jewish authors. For example, the books of the very thorough Jewish historian Gershon Scholem. Or the statements of such influential Jewish thinkers as Ahad-Haam or M. Buber, the book of the founder of Zionism Herzl, the memoirs of one of the leaders of this movement H. Weizmann.

The third group includes the works of Jewish authors who act as Jews, but who are opponents of the prevailing trend in some Jewish circles. An example is the book "Russia and the Jews", published in 1923 by six Jews who were in exile. They in no way renounce their Jewishness. But the whole book is permeated by the conviction that Jews living in Russia should first of all think of themselves as citizens of Russia. And this point of view leads them to completely new conclusions on such issues as the participation of Jews in the preparation of the revolution, in the establishment of the Bolshevik power in the Civil War, etc. - up to the unexpected assessment of Jewish victims in the Jewish pogroms during the Civil War, in the mouth of Jewish authors. Another example is S. Margolin, whom we have already quoted. She writes, for example:

*The question of the role and place of Jews in Soviet history is one of the most important, although at the same time one of the most tabooized questions of our time.*

Another book of this type is "Jewish History - Jewish Religion. The Heavy Three Millennia" by Israel Shahak (published in English in 1994). The author is a Jewish patriot and patriot of the State of Israel. He was born in Poland in 1933, received a Jewish religious education, moved to Israel in 1945, and served there in the army. Precisely on the basis of his patriotic Jewish position, the author considers the medieval rabbinical ideology, which, in his opinion, now dominates in Israel, to be disastrous. He urges:

*to begin an honest assessment of the Jewish past, to realize that Jewish chauvinism and a sense of being chosen exist, and to openly reconsider the attitude of Judaism towards non-Jews.*

To the fourth group of sources, I will classify statements contained in historical writings, which in other, widely known issues, have proven themselves objectively. Or the statements of authors whose reputation is generally recognized - such as sociologists M. Weber and W. Sombart.

The fifth group is, in my opinion, statements with a clearly verifiable reference. As an example, I will cite the book by D. Reed "The Controversy about Zion". The book splits quite clearly into two parts. One of them sets out the author's point of view, according to which over the course of several millennia, a small tribe (or caste) of Levites has systematically established power over the world. It is led by a secret government located in Palestine, then in Persia, then in Spain, then in Poland. His weapon was, in particular, the secret order of the Illuminati, which made the French Revolution. This line continues, according to the author, until about the 1950s, when the book was written. I do not undertake to support or deny such a picture. But it is noticeable that when the author talks about the end of the XIX century. or about the 20th century, the nature of the presentation changes dramatically. He provides many references to books and newspapers that can be used without necessarily taking the picture sketched above. The author was, apparently, a major international journalist, kept in his archives

newspaper clippings on the issue that interested him. Some of the books to which he refers, I got out - they fully correspond to their presentation, which is given in the book. (For example, using the bibliography of this book, I got acquainted with the amazing history of the persecution of Christianity in Mexico in the 1920s. The writer G. Green wrote about this in several bright books.) If this book contains a text taken in quotation marks and accompanied reference (for example, "New York Times", October 11, 1956) - it is difficult to imagine that the author simply invented it. The author's general concept is just poorly confirmed by subsequent events - he asserts, for example, that Jewish domination over the world is carried out through the subordination of the West to the Soviet Union! But a lot of specific facts, well-cited, are very helpful. The same can be said about the book "The Jewish Question through the Eyes of an American" by the contemporary American author D. Duke. His judgments about Russian affairs are often in doubt. For example, already in the preface, he says that "in the first government of Communist Russia there were only 13 ethnic Russians and over 300 Jews out of a total of 384 commissars." What government and what commissioners is the author talking about? The Council of People's Commissars was incomparably smaller in number, while there were commissars in every army, regiment, company. There were thousands of them. According to other sources, the figure in "384 Commissioner" traces back to the journalist Wilton, who was the Times correspondent in Russia during the revolution. It is possible that Wilton had in mind a certain list of surnames, knowing which we could judge how convincing he gives a picture. But without such a list, this statement turns into a typical example of a statement that can neither be confirmed nor refuted, since its very meaning is incomprehensible. But worse, on a purely American issue, Duke writes of "hundreds of thousands of American soldiers" who died in Vietnam. The standard figure for American casualties in Vietnam, which is usually quoted, is 50,000. If the author has reason to doubt this figure, it would be very important (for the Americans themselves) that they were given - which is not in the book. But, on the other hand, the book contains a large number of quotes from specific books, which I was able to get hold of and verify that the quotes are accurate. Therefore, I consider it possible to quote from this book (provided with an accurate reference) which I myself was not able to verify. Another source of the same type is personal impressions. They can be found in the book by D. Reed. There are especially many of them in the book of Shulgin, a witness to many dramatic events in our history - and at the same time, an acute observer. His book on Russian - Jewish relations reveals a common flaw in his generation - he does not verify the facts he carefully cites. For example, the book contains a list of the pseudonyms of some revolutionary leaders. Already in 1929, when Shulgin was writing his book, there were many reference books, according to which he could establish that the real name of Zinoviev is Radomyslsky, not Apfelbaum, Uritsky is not a pseudonym. And the real surname, Martynov, is Pikker, not Zibar (although this does not call into question his main assertion - that a huge number of Bolshevik leaders of Jewish origin had Russian pseudonyms). But Shulgin's personal impressions and observations from this are no less interesting.

Finally, the sixth group of sources can be called those that simply do not need "trust" - these are inferences, the convincingness of which everyone can judge for himself.

Thus, it is still possible to collect a sufficient number of sources on which it is possible to rely.

In this work, each quote will not be accompanied by a link, so as not to clutter up the text. But at the end of each paragraph there is a literature in which those interested can find the facts given in this paragraph, as well as a lot of interesting things on the same topic.

## **LITERATURE**

Dostoevsky F.M. - "Diary of a Writer" for 1877

Shafarevich I. Russophobia. Works Vol. 2. M. 1994.

Graetz H. - Geschichte der Juden, Bd. 11.

Mommsen T. - Roman history, vol. III.

Magazine "Red Archive", vol. IY, YI, X.

Magazine "22", Tel Aviv, 1978; Don Levin - "On the Edge of Temptation".

Kozhinov V. Magazine "Holy Russia", N 3, 2000.

Margolina Sonja. "Das Ende der Lugen" Berlin 1992.

Shahak Israel "Histoire juive-Religion juive. Le poids de trois millenaires" 1996.

Zenkovsky V.V. "On the themes of historiosophy" in the book "The Mystery of Israel" St. Petersburg 1993.

Reed D. The Zion Controversy (Translated from English).

Duke D. "The Jewish Question through the Eyes of an American". M. 2001.

Shulgin V. V. "What we don't like about them". M. 1992.

## Chapter 2. Antiquity

Outwardly, the history of Judea and Jews in the era of antiquity is no different from the history of any small state in the Middle East and one of the many peoples inhabiting the Mediterranean. At one time, Judea was included in the sphere of influence of Egypt. Then it was conquered (its northern part) by Assyria, then (the rest) - by the New Babylonian kingdom. Large empires of that time often solved national problems by resettling their peoples (as in the 1940s in the Soviet Union or in Poland and Czechoslovakia, where the Germans were evicted from areas densely populated by them). The same was the fate of the Jews ("Babylonian captivity"). Such resettlements contributed to the creation of a large diaspora. After the subordination of the Middle East to the Persian Empire, some of the Jews who wished to return to their homeland received permission to do so. Judea, as part of the Persian kingdom, it was conquered during the campaigns of Alexander the Great and entered his empire. After his death, it became the subject of controversy for two Hellenistic monarchies: the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Asia. It changed hands more than once, which was again accompanied by significant migrations of the Jewish population to the victorious country. But in the end, Judea became part of the Seleucid empire. Taking advantage of the weakening of this empire and relying on the support of Rome, which increasingly influenced the entire Mediterranean, Judea again achieved independence for a time, under the rule of first the high priest, then the king. However, she increasingly fell under the influence of Rome and in the 6th year of the 1st century. after R.Kh. became a Roman province. Roman rule provoked uprisings, which were severely suppressed (as happened in other provinces). After the 66-70 uprising. 1st century after R.H., suppressed by the emperors Vespasian and Titus, the Jerusalem temple was destroyed and the title of high priest abolished, but Judaism as a religion in the Empire was not oppressed, the power of the Sanhedrin (spiritual court), the patriarch, remained for a long time.

However, behind this facade, which is quite standard for ancient history, some fundamental differences are hidden. Two factors fundamentally distinguish ancient Jews from other peoples of the Mediterranean: this is their religion - i.e. The Old Testament with the teaching about the chosen people contained in it - and the unusual solidarity and influence of the Jewish diaspora.

The Old Testament created the worldview of a people chosen by God, who is destined to play the role of the leader and ruler of humanity, to whom all other nations are intended to serve, for the sake of which the whole world can only be created. Here we come into contact with the very core of the phenomenon of interest to us. This amazing, nowhere else worldview has determined the attitude of Jewry to the rest of humanity for thousands of years. Therefore, we will try now, if possible, to characterize it with a number of quotations from the Old Testament, even risking, perhaps, to tire the reader with the abundance of these quotations.

*Thus says the Lord of hosts: in those days, ten people from all peoples of different languages will take hold of the floor of Judah and will say: we will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.*

*(Zechariah 8.23)*

*Then the sons of foreigners will build your walls, and their kings will serve you; for in my anger I struck you, but in my good pleasure I will be merciful to you.*

*And your gates will always be open, they will not be closed either by day or by night, so that the wealth of the nations may be brought to you and their kings be brought.*

*For the people and kingdoms that do not want to serve you will perish, and such nations will be completely destroyed.*

*(Isaiah 60, 10-12)*

*And kings shall be thy nourishers, and their queens thy nurses; They will bow down to you with their faces to the ground, and lick the dust of your feet, and you will know that I am the Lord, that those who trust in Me will not be ashamed.*

*(Isaiah 49, 23)*

*For you will spread to the right and to the left, and your offspring will take possession of the nations and populate the devastated cities.*

*(Isaiah 54, 3)*

*And the peoples will take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel will take them for itself in the land of the Lord as servants and slaves and will take captive those who have taken it captive, and will rule over their oppressors.*

*(Isaiah 14, 2)*

*And strangers will come and feed your flocks; and the sons of foreigners will be your cultivators and your husbandmen.*

*And you will be called priests of the Lord - they will call you servants of our God; you will enjoy the property of the peoples and be glorified by their glory.*

*(Isaiah 61, 5-6)*

Other nations were perceived as worshipers of false gods, dangerous seducers who could divert Israel from serving the true God. In relation to them, suspicion, hostility and

cruelty were instilled, unusual even for those times. A double morality was asserted - the attitude towards the pagans as being of a different kind, who were not subject to the laws given to Israel. Over which Israel is destined to rule not simply by the right of the strong, not by virtue of belonging to a higher culture (as, for example, the Greeks understood the opposition of the Hellenes to barbarians), but by the will of a higher power that does not need justification or arguments.

*Do not enter into an alliance with the inhabitants of that land, so that when they commit fornication after their gods and offer sacrifices to their gods, they will not invite you, and you would not taste their sacrifice.*

*And do not take from their daughters as wives to your sons, lest their daughters, after committing fornication after their gods, lead your sons into wandering after their gods.*

*(Exodus 34, 15-16)*

*And in the cities of these peoples, whom the Lord your God gives you for possession, do not leave a single soul alive.*

*But give them to the curse: the Hittites and the Amorites, and the Canaanites and the Perremites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, as the Lord your God has commanded you.*

*So that they do not teach you to do the same abominations that they did for their gods, and so that you do not sin before the Lord your God.*

*(Deuteronomy, 20, 16-18)*

*For they are My servants whom I brought out of the land of Egypt; one must not sell them as one sells slaves.*

*Do not rule over them with cruelty, and fear your God.*

*And so that your servant and your maidservant may be with you, buy yourself a slave and a slave girl from the nations that are around you.*

*Likewise, you can buy from the children of the settlers who settled with you, and from their tribe, which is with you, which was born to them in your land, and they can be your property.*

*You can pass them on as an inheritance and to your sons by yourself, as an estate; keep them as slaves forever. But over your brothers, the children of Israel, do not rule over one another with cruelty.*

*(Leviticus 25, 42-46)*



*Recover from a foreigner, but what will be yours from your brother, forgive.*

*(Deuteronomy 15, 3)*

*Give it to a foreigner in growth, but don't give it to your brother in growth.*

*(Deuteronomy 23, 20)*

*And Moses said to them, Why did you keep all the women alive?*

*Here they, according to the advice of Balaam, were for the children of Israel an excuse for apostasy from the Lord ...*

*And so kill all the male children and all the women who know the husband on the male bed, kill.*

*(Numbers 31,15-17)*

*And at that time they took all his cities, and put to the curse all the cities, men and women and children, leaving no one alive.*

*(Deuteronomy 2:34)*

*And they put to the curse everything in the city, and men and women, young and old, and oxen, and sheep, and donkeys, they destroyed everything with the sword.*

*(Joshua 6:20)*

*The Lord said: "I will return from Bashan, I will bring you out of the depths of the sea.*

*So that you immerse your foot, like your dogs, your tongue, in the blood of enemies. "*

*(Psalm 67, 23-24)*

The second factor, scattering, is almost as ancient in origin. During a grandiose historical period - from the middle of the 1st millennium BC. to this day, most of the Jewish people lived outside their homeland, among other peoples, without mixing with them and without losing their national identity. In particular, this was the case in the period in question now: between the middle of the 1st millennium BC. and by the middle of the 1st millennium after R.Kh. "The Jewish people are spread throughout the earth, scattered among the inhabitants of many countries." "There is not a single city of the Hellenes and not a single barbarian people, where our custom of celebrating the Sabbath, fasting and lighting candles, has not penetrated" - Josephus writes. Indeed,

the testimony of ancient authors and excavation data show that the Jews were spread throughout the ancient world: from Spain to the Euphrates, from Ethiopia to Gaul, from Mauritania to the Crimea. "It is difficult to point out a place in the world where this people would not find a place for themselves and did not become a master," says Strabo. Among the population of the second most important city of the Roman Empire - Alexandria, Jews at one time constituted almost the majority. Their total number in the Roman Empire is estimated at 5-7 million - from 10 to 12% of the total population.

A mixture of nationalities was characteristic of the ancient world: the Assyrian and Persian kingdoms, the Hellenistic monarchies and the Roman Empire. But the scattering of the Jews had several features that made it a completely unique phenomenon.

First of all, the fact that most of the Jews lived outside their historical homeland, Judea. The Soviet historian S.Ya. Lurie dates the beginning of this phenomenon to the era of the "Babylonian captivity" (586-538 BC), when the majority of the population of Judea was first resettled in the inner regions of Mesopotamia, and then received permission to return to their homeland - or even earlier. Lurie writes:

*In the era of the Babylonian captivity, and probably even earlier, the Jews were predominantly a people of the diaspora. Palestine was only a religious and partly cultural center.*

*The post-prisoner Jerusalem itself was an artificial formation of the diaspora centered in Babylon.*

Mommsen expresses this idea even more clearly:

*The history of the Jewish country was just as little the history of the Jewish people as the history of the papal dominions was the history of Catholicism.*

But the inhabitants of Palestine were only a part, and not the most significant part, of the Jewish people. (We are talking about the era of Hellenism.) The Jewish communities - Babylonian, Syrian, Asia Minor, Egyptian - were much more significant than the Palestinian ones. (...) These latter did not play such an important role as the Jewish diaspora, which was an extremely peculiar phenomenon, played during the empire.

The second special feature of the Jewish diaspora was cohesion, a sense of belonging to a single organization and often opposing Jews to the world around them. "Their capital is the holy city of Jerusalem, and as citizens they belong to the city in which they were born and raised," Philo writes. Every Jew who reached the age of twenty had to pay tribute in favor of the Jerusalem Temple and visit it at least once in his life. The Acts of the Apostles paint a vivid picture:

*In Jerusalem there were Jews, devout people, from every nation under heaven (...). Parthians and Medes, and Elamites and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea*

*and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and parts of Libya adjacent to Cyrene, and those who came from Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians.*

*(Acts 2, 5; 2, 9-11)*

Philo quotes a letter from King Agrippa of Judea to Emperor Caligula. He asks for some privileges and promises support to the emperor for this. But it is interesting that at the same time he acts as a representative of the entire diaspora. For example, it lists in which localities the Jews are influential: Egypt, Phenicia, Syria, Pamphylia, Cilicia and most of the other provinces of Asia up to Bithynia. And in Europe - Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Attica, Aetolia, Corinth and Peloponnes. Also Evbeia, Cyprus and Crete. And the lands beyond the Euphrates.

Flavius cites a rescript of Julius Caesar, in which he recognizes Hyrcanus II with his descendants as "Jewish ethnarchs", and from the context we can conclude that we are talking about power over the Jews of the diaspora. The uprisings in Judea caused unrest throughout the Roman Empire. Dio Cassius even claims that during the Roman siege of Jerusalem, aid to the besieged came not only from the Jews of the Empire, but also from the regions east of the Euphrates.

In the previous chapter, there was a quote from Mommsen showing how the attitude of a Roman official towards Jews in the provinces was unexpectedly reflected in his career in Rome. Cicero said:

*You know, Lelius, what this gang is, how they stick together, what influence they have in meetings. Therefore, I will speak in a low voice so that only the judges can hear me, because there are many people who are ready to set this crowd on me and on every decent person, and we do not want to make it easier ...*

*(translation by S.Ya. Lurie)*

This feeling of unity in the scattering was supported by forces that prevented them from dissolving into the surrounding national and cultural environment, and supported the isolation of Jewry. Such a role was played by complex, thoroughly developed rituals, the fulfillment of which was a prerequisite for belonging to Judaism: circumcision, numerous restrictions on food, fasting, keeping the Sabbath, etc. But also just the ideology of alienation, for which the Old Testament provided such abundant food.

Thus, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah describe the sin that the Jews who remained in Palestine during the period of "captivity" fell into, taking foreign wives and producing half-blood children from them, as well as cleansing from this sin. Ezra writes:

*At the end of this, the rulers came up to me and said: The people of Israel and the priests and Levites did not separate from the peoples of other nations with their abominations, from the Canaanites, Hittites, Perremites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Egyptians and Amorites.*

*Because they took their daughters for themselves and for their sons, and the holy seed was mingled with foreign nations ...*

*Hearing this word, I tore my underwear and my overcoat, and tore the hair of my beard, and sat sad.*

*(Ezd 9, 1-3)*

Likewise Nehemiah:

*Even in those days I saw the Jews who took wives from the women of Azot, Ammon, and Moab.*

*And that is why their sons half speak Azot, or the language of other nations, and do not know how to speak Jewish.*

*For this I reprimanded and cursed them, and beat some of the husbands, tore their hair and conjured them with God so that they would not give their daughters for their sons and would not take their daughters for their sons.*

*(Neh. 13, 23-25)*

A radical decision was made:

*... we have committed a crime before our God that we took foreign wives from the peoples of the earth for ourselves; but there is still hope for Israel in this matter.*

*Let us now conclude a covenant with our God that, according to the advice of my lord and those who revere the commandments of our God, we will let go of all the wives and children born of them - and let it be according to the law!*

*(Ezra 10, 2-3)*

*And Ezra the priest arose and said to them: You have committed a crime by taking foreign wives for yourself, and thereby increased the guilt of Israel.*

*So, repent of this before the Lord, the God of your fathers, and do his will, and separate yourself from the peoples of the earth and from foreign wives.*

*And the whole assembly answered, and said with a loud voice, As you have said, so we will do.*

*(Ezd. 10, 10-12)*

In the first centuries B.C. and after R.Kh. a large literature of Jewish origin arose, sometimes oriented towards a Jewish reader who assimilated Greek culture. Some of these works were later called "apocryphal". For example, Book III of Ezra says:

*As for the other nations descended from Adam, You said that they are nothing, but they are like saliva, and You have likened all their multitude to drops dripping from a vessel.*

*(III book. Ezra 6, 56)*

The Book of Jubilees (an apocryphal Jewish work written in the 2nd century BC) even threatens with death for mixed marriage. It also says:

*But you, my son, stay away from other peoples, do not eat with them, do not follow their customs, do not make comrades among them. For their deeds are not clean, and their ways are abominable.*

In the "Letter of Aristeus" emanating from the Jewish environment, we read:

*The lawgiver, to whom God gave the knowledge of all things, surrounded us with an impenetrable fence and granite wall, so that we would not have communion with any people, remaining pure in soul and body, alien to senseless false teachings.*

And more specifically, in the Talmud, created in the first centuries after Christ, prohibitions are given to invite a foreigner (goy) to your home, to provide him with any hospitality, to lend him your field or your bathhouse, etc. etc.

But, perhaps, the most striking feature of ancient Jewry was that this tendency towards isolation peacefully coexisted with the desire for assimilation (albeit external), for entering the surrounding cultural environment and influencing the surrounding life.

Thus, Jews often occupied a high position in city government, in the management of finances and the army in the Hellenistic states. Many Jewish authors wrote in Greek or Latin to a wide, non-Jewish audience. The Jews adopted all the external signs of the Greco-Latin culture, often changing even names: sometimes according to the principle of consonance (for example, Esther - Aster, Moses - Musy), sometimes - according to translation (for example, Zadok - Justus - just, Solomon - Irenaeus - peace) ... But this was in no way a sign of complete inclusion in the common life of the ancient world. High-ranking Jews vigorously defended the interests of Jews in their city or province, and sometimes in other provinces. The interests of Jewish authors who wrote in Greek and Latin revolved around the position of the Jews, their role in the world.

Flavius wrote, for example:

*Other people also adopted laws from us, taking them more and more as a model. The first were the Greek philosophers, although they, apparently, kept*

*their domestic laws in their affairs, in their philosophy they followed him (Moses) more and more.*

Or Aristobulus:

*As you know, Plato took our laws as a model and, obviously, knew them in detail. After all, he was very greedy for knowledge, like Pythagoras, who learned a lot from us in his teaching. I think that Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato, when they investigated everything, in the end began to follow these (Mosaic) laws.*

Elsewhere, he claims that "Homer and Hesiod respected the holy feast of the Sabbath."

Associated with the same tendency for the penetration of Jews into society is the situation developed at that time, according to which the son of a Jewish woman from a mixed marriage was a full-fledged Jew. How it got along with the negative attitude towards mixed marriages, examples of which we cited - apparently, no one could explain this!

Moreover, the Jews carried out extremely intensive propaganda, recruiting proselytes among the surrounding population.

As the Gospel says:

*Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for you go around the sea and land in order to convert at least one: and when this happens, make him a son of Gehenna, twice as bad as you.*

*(Matt. 23, 15)*

Flavius more than once reports how, during wars, the Jews forced their defeated neighbors to convert to Judaism, for example:

*Hyrchanus took the Edomite cities of Adara and Marissa and, having subjugated all the Edomites to his power, allowed them to remain in the country, but only on the condition that they accept circumcision and generally build their lives according to the Jewish model.*

*He rendered great services to his fatherland by waging a war with Iterea and annexing a significant part of this country to Judea, and forced those of the Itureans who wanted to stay in their area to accept circumcision and live according to the laws of the Jews.*

*The Jews attracted many Hellenes to their worship and included them, in some way, among their own.*

Such a proselyte was, for example, the wife of the emperor Nero - Poppea, cousin and sister of the emperor Domitian.

Literature oriented towards proselytes emphasized the "philosophical", "moral" meaning of Jewish rites, pushing into the background the ritual side of Judaism. Apparently, proselytes were not full members of Jewish communities, they were exempted from many rituals, forming a layer of "sympathizers" or clients around the core of Judaism itself. They even had a special name - "Those who worship the true God." When addressing (or recruiting) proselytes, Jewish writers have often portrayed Judaism as the ancestor of "pagan religions." S.Ya. Lurie calls it "goods for sale". What is the point, he asks, in such proselytes who have not even grasped that monotheism is the basis of Judaism? Lurie's explanation is that "the people living in the diaspora should not neglect any ally."

Thus, the Jewish diaspora in antiquity was, apparently, some very special phenomenon, in principle different from the Greek or Syrian quarters of any city of that time.

Its unusualness should have attracted the attention of contemporaries all the more since the Jews had a significant impact on the life of the surrounding society. So, during the reign of Ptolemy III Evergete, Joseph, the son of Tobias, took over all the taxes of Egyptian Syria for 22 years. During the reign of Ptolemy Philomater and his sister Cleopatra, the supreme power in Egypt was mainly in the hands of the Jews. For example, Onia and Dosifei commanded the troops. The daughter of Ptolemy VI, Cleopatra, appointed Ananias, the son of Onias, and Halik as generals. "Without their advice, she did nothing," says Flavius. The so-called Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, which depicts the friction between Jews and Greeks in Alexandria and the embassy of both to Trajan in Rome, paints a vivid picture.

The influence of the Jews has always increased during the formation of "world monarchies", which united many nationalities in one state. Mommsen explains this by the fact that the creators of such monarchies saw in the Jews a support in suppressing the national aspirations of the conquered peoples. The creator of the Persian kingdom, Cyrus, allowed Jews who wanted to repatriate from Mesopotamia to Palestine. According to Josephus Flavius, when Alexandria was founded, Alexander the Great gave Jews equal rights with the Macedonians (i.e. conquerors). The Jews received a number of privileges in the Roman Empire from Caesar, these privileges were confirmed by Augustus. One historian calls them "the real Magna Carta." Jews were exempted from taxes, the sending of tribute to the Jerusalem temple was allowed (while the export of gold was prohibited in general), their assemblies were controlled by their self-government, they had legal autonomy, while Roman law was considered one of the main means of unifying the empire. In fact, it was extraterritoriality.

The economic influence of Jewry was also great. In Alexandria, the richest city in the empire, the richest merchants were Jews. In their hands was the grain trade, vital for the entire state.

The strength and cohesion of the Jewish diaspora was demonstrated by two uprisings that broke out in the Roman Empire in the 2nd century. after R.Kh. The first occurred in about 118 AD, when the Emperor Trajan was involved in a war with the Parthians. It

covered a number of provinces: Cyrenaica, Egypt, Cyprus, Mesopotamia. As Mommsen writes, the goal was "the expulsion of both the Romans and the Hellenes and, it seems, was meant to establish a special Jewish state." Judging by the scale of the unrest, it would be a state that would unite the entire eastern Mediterranean. Historians write about the atrocities that accompanied the uprising. For example, Dio Cassius asserts that during the uprising raised by the Jews in Cyrene, they not only killed all the Greeks and Romans (220,000 people), but were also crowned with their guts, washed with their blood, covered with their skins. Orosius writes that having taken the city of Salamis in Cyprus,

Of course, the numerical data given by ancient authors usually do not claim to be accurate. Such statements only show that the authors, who lived at a time close to the events that took place, considered the number of victims to be very high, and the cruelties to be beyond the ordinary.

The uprising was suppressed, but for this the troops were used, intended for the war with the Parthians. Trajan was forced to end the war (and generally the expansion to the east).

The second uprising took place in about 130 AD in Palestine under the Emperor Hadrian. At the head of the rebels was the priest Eleazar and the leader of the fighting detachments Simon, nicknamed Bar Kokhba (Son of the Star). Perhaps the latter declared himself the Messiah. The uprising was also very fierce, but it was suppressed. Instead of Jerusalem, the Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina was founded, where Jews were prohibited from entering on pain of death. The name of Judea was also eliminated - the province became known as Syria of the Philistines or Palestine. Some historians believe that both uprisings were planned as one, but this plan was not implemented.

It is not surprising that ancient authors wrote a lot about the Jews, their history, customs and influence on life. Their judgments produce a very strange impression: they are surprisingly unanimous in their negative attitude towards "Jewry", although the specific accusations are so heterogeneous that it is not easy to guess their common cause. There are also completely senseless inventions here. For example, Diodorus claims that the Jews descended from a part of the Egyptian population suffering from some kind of skin disease and for this they were expelled from their country. The same version is given by Manetho.

Some authors proceed from a negative assessment of the religion of the Jews, believing that it is "hostile to humanity." Tacitus says, about the religion of the Jews, that they revere everything that is despised by other peoples, and despises everything that is sacred with them.

A similar thought is expressed by Diodorus:



*They profess the laws of hatred against humanity. For of all nations, they alone are forbidden to communicate with others. Moses gave them these misanthropic laws.*

Hecateus of Abder, who lived under Ptolemy I in the III century. B.C. wrote about Moses:

*in retaliation for his own expulsion (from Egypt), he taught his people to avoid people and hate foreigners*

He calls the laws of Moses "hostile to foreigners."

The teacher of Cicero - Apollonius of Rhodes - wrote a polemical essay against the Jews, where he reproaches them for denying the Greek gods, misanthropy and isolation from all who believe otherwise.

The Jews were also reproached for alienation and hostility towards others, which manifested itself even in everyday life. Juvenal writes:

*They will not show a stranger the way, only they will lead them to a cool spring.*

The poet Rutilius Namatian says:

*Their heart is colder than their religion itself.*

Finally, fears were often expressed that the Jews were subjugating the life of other peoples: the same Namatian, for example, wrote:

*Let the terror-bearing weapons of Pompey and Titus*

*The country of Judea has not conquered us at all!*

*Having torn it out of the soil, they let the infection through the world,*

*And since then the winner has been groaning under the yoke of a slave.*

*(Translated by S. Ya. Lurie)*

This thought seems to have been widespread. For example, St. Augustine quotes Seneca's words:

*Thus, the vanquished prescribe laws to the victors.*

All these inventions, exaggerations, sweeping accusations, theological, social and psychological observations can still have something in common. They portray Jewry as a single cohesive whole, alien to the surrounding life, to ancient society as a whole. One can imagine the antipathy, irritation, and sometimes fear, which caused this strange formation, scattered, but spiritually united; penetrating into political, economic and cultural life and at the same time professing a religion of extreme alienation ("separate yourself from the peoples of the earth"), recruiting proselytes who do not even comprehend the central dogma of their religion, but already cease to be Hellenes, Romans, Egyptians, break out of their national and cultural environment.

In different countries of the ancient world and in different eras of ancient history, clashes between the local population and the Jews of the Diaspora are evidenced. Back in the 5th century BC. such clashes are noted in Elephantine in the south of Egypt - they are associated with the Persian conquest and the protection that the Persians have on the Jews. During the reign of Emperor Caligula, a violent feud broke out in Alexandria. Caligula spoke out against the Jews who did not want to worship his statue, but then Claudius replaced him and canceled the decision. The two main opponents of the Jews were condemned to death.

S.Ya. Lurie in his book "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World" explains this unusual for antiquity "incompatibility" of Jews with other population by the fact that Jews constitute a "special" nation, not concentrated on one territory, but living among others - but nevertheless, possessing a national-state feeling, which, however, finds expression in them not through language or state. If we add that this nation actively influenced the life of the countries in which it lived, subjugating some aspects of their life and destroying others, then this will partly explain the anti-Jewish sentiments of ancient society.

Here are the opinions of three major historians:

Edward Mayer:

*Together with Jewry, its eternal companion came into the world - hatred of Jews (Judenhass). It is fundamentally wrong, as they do now, to consider it a product of modern times or Christianity. Already in the psalms, it is spoken of all the time. Not their God and religion in itself were the cause of ridicule, contempt and persecution of the Jews by the pagans, but the arrogant belief in their superiority, with which they, as the only confessors of the true God, opposed themselves to all other peoples, denied any contact with them as unclean, considered themselves superior and better than them, destined to rule over them. To those who did not become a proselyte through revelation, the Jews seemed as unclean and repulsive as he was to them. The Jews perceived this contradiction with all the more bitterness, that it seemed to them the conversion of the natural order of things: therefore, all the repeated demands of the Judgment, Reckoning with sinners, the calls of the day of Yahweh. The driving force here was the thirst for revenge, and not the desire to comprehend the mystery of the Divine. Hatred of the pagans was the flip side of the desire to convert them. Therefore, in the*

*impotence of modernity, fantasy more and more vividly painted pictures of the extermination of pagans.*

Max Weber:

*The general spread of "anti-Semitism" in antiquity is a fact. It is also indisputable that this gradually growing negative attitude towards Jews developed in parallel with the growth of the negative attitude of Jews towards communion with Gentiles. Antique negative attitude towards Jews was fundamentally different from "racial antipathy": this shows, for example, the grandiose scope of Jewish proselytism. It was the negative attitude of the Jews themselves that determined how the relationship developed. There were more than enough unusual and seemingly absurd customs in antiquity: this, of course, was not the reason. The emphasized refusal to respect the gods of the polis to which they were guests, of course, was perceived as an insult and godlessness. But this was not decisive either. "Human hatred" of the Jews - this was, if you look at the root, the decisive and final reproach: denial of living together, rapprochement and companionship of any kind, even on business grounds. One should not underestimate the exceptionally strong repulsion of everyone who stands on the basis of pharisaism from cooperation with the Gentiles - a moment whose economic effect their pagan competitors could not fail to notice. The social isolation of Jews, this "ghetto" in the deepest sense of the word, was originally chosen and created solely on their own initiative - and over time to an increasing extent (...). And hand in hand with unconditional isolation from the ritually impure passionate recruitment of proselytes. One should not underestimate the exceptionally strong repulsion of everyone who stands on the basis of pharisaism from cooperation with the Gentiles - a moment whose economic effect their pagan competitors could not fail to notice. The social isolation of Jews, this "ghetto" in the deepest sense of the word, was originally chosen and created solely on their own initiative - and over time to an increasing extent (...). And hand in hand with unconditional isolation from the ritually impure passionate work of recruiting proselytes. One should not underestimate the exceptionally strong repulsion of everyone who stands on the basis of pharisaism from cooperation with the Gentiles - a moment whose economic effect their pagan competitors could not fail to notice. The social isolation of Jews, this "ghetto" in the deepest sense of the word, was originally chosen and created solely on their own initiative - and over time to an increasing extent (...). And hand in hand with unconditional isolation from the ritually impure passionate work of recruiting proselytes.*

T. Mommsen attributes the emergence of alienation between the Jewish diaspora and the rest of the population of the ancient world as early as the 1st century. after R.Kh. He writes about this era:

*Foreigners Jews have always been and wanted to be; but the feeling of alienation intensified both in themselves and against them, to the extreme, and from it both sides began persistently to extract its vile harmful*

*consequences. From the light ridicule of Horace over the obsessive Jews from the Roman Ghetto, there was a great step to Tacitus's unconditional hatred of these monsters of the human race, for whom everything pure is unclean, and everything unclean is pure. (...)*

*The life of the Jews alongside the non-Jews became more and more inevitable and under the given conditions more and more impossible; the opposition in beliefs, laws, morals intensified, and both mutual contempt and mutual hatred had a destructive effect on morality in both directions. (...)*

*This bitterness, this arrogance and this hatred, in the form in which they arose at that time, of course, were only an inevitable sprout, perhaps no less inevitable sowing; but the legacy left by those times still weighs heavily on humanity.*

With the decline of antiquity, the influence of Jewry falls sharply. The decrease in the importance of cities undoubtedly played a role here - and the Jews were largely urban dwellers, and the decrease in the role of trade and finance - and these were the occupations of the Jews that created their weight in society. But the main reason was the emergence of Christianity and its victory as the organizing force of life. A Christian society arose, and it became impossible to actively participate in its life, while at the same time belonging to another - the Jewish community. The Jews were forced to make a choice, and they chose isolation - now complete, going into the ghetto.

The role of Christianity in this change in the position of the Jews is very clearly felt, for example, by Gretz. In volume I of the History of the Jewish People, speaking about the emergence of Christianity, he writes:

*this geek with a mask of death was destined to inflict many painful wounds on the Jews later.*

And this revolution took place, according to Gretz, just at the moment when Jewry was close to achieving its goal: "to become a teacher of mankind."

Antiquity in relations with Jews demonstrates to us features that sometimes surprisingly resemble modern times, even the last century or the last decades. But in some respects it is like a reduced model, a "rehearsal", which often precede major historical events. Like our revolution of 1917 had a "rehearsal" in 1905. This primarily refers to real political domination. Although we meet very influential Jews - military leaders or financiers - nothing can be pointed out that is analogous to the Jewish elite of the Soviet Union in the first decades of communist rule or the elite of the financial world and media leadership in the modern West. And what is especially painful to remember is the leadership of terrorist actions against non-Jewish peoples. Such figures as Rosalia Samoilovna Zemlyachka or Madeleine Albright are not described by ancient authors. When Cicero alludes to Jewish influence in the Roman Forum, it can be assessed as an oratorical device. In addition, the relationship with the Jews was

discussed freely, there are no signs of censorship in this area, which is so characteristic of modern life.

But the fundamental factors that determine the situation of "Jewry" now are already evident in antiquity. This is a mysterious combination of the strictest Old Testament and Talmudic commandments with an active entry into the common Hellenistic culture of antiquity. As Mommsen says:

*Despite the fact that most of the Jews settled in foreign countries and masses of foreigners and even destructive Hellenic elements penetrated into their sphere, all Jews together remained in the very depths of their consciousness in such a unity, which at present provides some analogy between the Vatican and the Kaaba.*

In the modern world, this is the unity, on the one hand, of the rabbinic and Talmudic ideology prevailing in Israel, and on the other of the "emancipated" or "reformed" Jewry of other countries. This is the "miraculous relationship" that Gretz observed in a fragile state in the 19th century. (cf. the quotation in Chapter 1).

## LITERATURE

Mommsen T., "Roman History", vol. V.

Tacitus, Annals, History.

Josephus Flavius, "The Jewish War", "Jewish Antiquities".

Augustine Bl., "On the City of God".

Juvenal, "Satyrs".

S.Ya. Lurie, "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World"; Petrograd, 1922.

Leon HG, The Names of Jews in the Ancient Rome, Trans. and Proc. Amer. Philol. Assoc., 59 (1928), p. 216.

Josephus Flavius, "Against Apion", Works, v. 5.

Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie, Lion, 1975, vv 24, 25, 31.

Dio Cassius, Roman History, London, 1927.

Diodorus Sicilius, Bibliothque historique, Paris, 1846.

Eusebius Pamphilus, Werke, Berlin, 1954, Bd 8.

Charles RH (transl.), The Book of Jubilee.

Reinach Th., Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme, Paris, 1894.

Belich J., Die Bevölkerung griechisch-romischen Welt, 1866.

Parvan, Die Nationalität der Kaufleute im römischen Kaiserreich, Breslau, 1909.

Meyer Ed., Geschichte des Altertums, Bd III, Stuttgart, 1901.

Graetz H., Geschichte der Juden, Bd I.

Weber M., Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie, Bd III, Das Antike Judentum, Tübingen, 1923.

Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Brockhaus and Efron, St. Petersburg, vol. II, article "Anti-Semitism" and vol. VII, article "Diaspora".

### **Chapter 3. Middle Ages.**

The history of Jewry in the Middle Ages is full of tragedy and dramatic contrasts. Jews were often subjected to restrictions and severe oppression. But then there were periods of prosperity, when they enjoyed many privileges, they influenced the most important aspects of the life of other peoples. However, these periods invariably ended with new persecutions, the expulsion of all Jews, and sometimes the physical extermination of entire communities, thousands of people.

The whole picture of the life of medieval Jewry will not be comprehensible if one does not constantly bear in mind this background of it - periodic cruel persecutions. So let's start by giving some examples.

In 1096, during the preparations for the First Crusade, the religious excitement that reigned at that time was often expressed in the fact that large groups of crusaders broke into Jewish quarters and demanded that Jews, on pain of death, be baptized. For the most part, this ended in the massacre of entire communities, sometimes in the mass suicide of Jews. Few communities were saved by being baptized. In Worms, 800 people were killed, in Mainz - 1000, the communities of Trier, Metz, Cologne were destroyed. In total, from 4 to 8 thousand people died in May-July 1096. On a smaller scale, the same thing was repeated in connection with the II Crusade of 1146.

In 1189, a rebellion broke out in London, which resulted in the massacre of Jews. It spread to all of England. In York, for example, the entire Jewish population was exterminated.

In connection with the accusations of desecrating holy gifts in Belitz, near Brandenburg, almost the entire Jewish population was burned.

In 1251, an attempt to organize a "crusade of the shepherds" resulted in a popular uprising known as the uprising of the "shepherds" (Pastorelli). The second uprising of the "shepherds" dates back to 1320. The Jews, whom they mercilessly exterminated, were the invariable object of hatred of the rebels. During the II uprising, the Jews, then expelled from the royal French possessions, lived only in the English possessions. But even there they were almost completely exterminated.

Charges of kidnapping and murder of Christian children in Rottenham (1298) led to the murder of Jews in Franconia, Bavaria and Austria.

In 1348-9, a terrible plague epidemic broke out in Western Europe: the "Black Death". About 1/3 of the population of Western Europe died, a much larger percentage than during World War I and II combined. It was widely believed among the people that this disaster was the result of a conspiracy of Jews to poison the wells in order to destroy all Christians. The result was uprisings and massacres of Jews - the most brutal in the Middle Ages. They were killed and burned in their homes and synagogues from the Mediterranean coast to northern Germany. In Frankfurt am Main and Mainz in 1349,

all Jews were killed. Mass beatings took place in Brussels (600 people died), Cologne, in the Netherlands. There are very few Jews left in Germany and the Netherlands.

In Seville in 1391, about 4,000 people were killed. Anti-Jewish uprisings also took over other cities in Spain.

The beatings of Jews, which took place during the anti-Polish uprisings in Ukraine, also belong to the same range of phenomena. For example, the Jewish population of Nemirov in 1648 was exterminated by the Khmelnytsky Cossacks, and, according to the Jewish chronicler, the Cossacks were allowed into the city and the local population helped them "out of hatred of the Jews." As the "Jewish Encyclopedia" writes, "The Jew tenant constantly faced the peasant, demanding a rent from him, forcing him to bear the corvee." One of Khmelnytsky's demands, for which he fought with the Polish authorities, was that a Jew had no right to be a tax farmer.

In the middle of the 17th century. part of Ukraine, which remained under Polish rule, was engulfed in uprisings, called the Gaidamatchins. Jews also became their victims in large numbers. The massacre in Uman in 1768 is especially famous. The Jewish historian Dubnov writes about it:

*Poles and Jews worked together on the city wall, firing at the besiegers with cannons and rifles; but they failed to defend the city. When the haidamaks burst into the city, they first of all rushed at the Jews (...). A mass of Jews, numbering up to three thousand people, locked themselves in a large synagogue. The Gaidamaks put a cannon at the door, the doors were blown up, robbers entered the synagogue and turned it into a massacre. Having finished with the Jews, the Haidamaks took up the Poles. ... ..*

According to the Brief Jewish Encyclopedia, about 20,000 people were killed in Uman, mostly Jews.

Another form of persecution that Jews had to face was their expulsion from certain states or certain cities. Here is a very incomplete list of such exiles.

*Even in antiquity from Rome: under Tiberius, Claudius.*

*In the VI century. from the Kingdom of Frankish by King Dagobert.*

*In 1119 from St. Edmond (England).*

*In 1182 from the royal possessions in France.*

*In 1239 from Brittany.*

*In 1234 from Newcastle.*



*In 1236 from Southampton.*

*In 1249 from France.*

*In 1290 from England under Edward I (the decree was canceled only by Cromwell in the 17th century).*

*In 1306 from France under Philip the Handsome.*

*In 1348 from Berlin.*

*In 1426 from Cologne.*

*In 1430 from Saxony.*

*In 1450 from Bavaria.*

*In 1475 from Bamberg.*

*In 1499 from Ulm and from Nuremberg.*

*In 1501 from France under Louis XII.*

*In 1267 from Moravia.*

*In 1454 from Brno.*

*From Frankfurt am Main in 1241, 1349, 1618*

*In 1439-40. from Augsburg.*

*In 1438 from Strasbourg.*

*In 1458 from Erfurt.*

*In 1519 from Regensburg.*

*In 1455 and 1670 from Vienna.*

*At the end of the fifteenth century. from the hereditary possessions of the Habsburgs.*

*At the beginning of the sixteenth century. from Prussia.*

*In 1492 from Spain and Sicily.*

*In 1496 from Portugal.*

*In 1498 from Navara.*

*In 1510 from Naples.*

*In 1550 from Genoa.*

*Many times from Venice, for example, in 1550.*

*In 1629 from Aachen.*

"Jewish Encyclopedia" gives the following figures: from England in the XIII century. 16,000 Jews were expelled from France in the XIV century. - 100,000, from Spain in the 15th century. - 200.000.

It would be wrong to conclude from these facts that the Jews were the object of hatred of the *entire* medieval society. Both Jewish and Christian chroniclers argue that the persecutors were almost always the *people*, the "rough rabble" and the lower clergy - sometimes also petty feudal lords. But popes, emperors, kings, bishops and major feudal lords invariably tried to protect Jews from persecution. Expulsions often took place under the influence of popular unrest, which the authorities could not cope with.

Back in the 5th century. Emperor Theodosius issued an edict prohibiting the destruction of synagogues and even tried to force the rebuilding of the destroyed synagogue. The truth is unsuccessful: the clergy spoke in favor of the fact that the construction of a synagogue for Christians is impossible for religious reasons.

Jewish historian of Jewry Roth writes:

*Until the present day, the crudest slander against the Jews has met with refutation from the Papacy (or even forbidden). Under the auspices of the popes, the community of Rome was the only one in Europe that existed from the classical period to the present day.*

Indeed, even Gregory the Great (590-604) demanded that the Jews be guaranteed their legal rights. This point of view has been accepted by the Catholic Church. Starting from Callistus II (1119-1124) and up to the 16th century. there is a series of papal bulls threatening Christians with excommunication for the forcible conversion of Jews to Christianity, violence, robbery, and interfering with worship. The bull of Pope Gregory X in 1272, for example, confirms that a Christian's testimony against a Jew is invalid unless it is corroborated by the testimony of a Jewish witness ... Starting from the bull of Innocent IV in 1247 to the bull of Clement XIII in 1763, the popes *forbid* to charge Jews with ritual murder, threatening the disobedient with excommunication. Those who raise false accusations must themselves be seen as murderers.

During the persecutions associated with the First Crusade, the bishops of Cologne and Speyer managed to save many Jews. The Bishop of Speyer executed several Christians involved in the killings. Bernard of Clairvaux spoke out against the persecution of Jews in connection with the Second Crusade in Germany. During the uprising of the "shepherds", the Jews took refuge in the papal possessions in Avignon. The Pope excommunicated the participants in the uprising from the church. In 1308, the Duke of Brabant, defending the Jews, dispersed the crowd of "shepherds" and killed many. The Pope approved of his actions.

"The Brief Jewish Encyclopedia" writes: "In the countries of medieval Europe (...) Jews were often under the direct patronage of the monarch and were often freed from the jurisdiction of local authorities."

In many countries, Jews had self-government, their own courts, which had the right to impose any punishment. This was the situation, for example, in Moorish Spain. In Portugal in the XIV century. there was a single head of the community for the entire state. The position of Jews in France, Italy, Germany, Poland, Lithuania was similar. In England, according to the decree of King Henry I (XII century), the Jews were to be in the whole state under the protection and patronage of the king. Must be judged by their fellow believers and swear by the Pentateuch. His son, Henry II, issued the so-called "Jewish Charter" (Harta Judeum). According to these laws, for example, in a litigation between a Jew and a Christian, the testimony of two witnesses was required: one Jew and one Christian. In France, the heir to Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, established a special position "Master of Judorum" for the protection of Jews. By edict of the king, it was forbidden to baptize slaves belonging to Jews.

In the 13th century, King Boleslav of Poland issued a regulation regulating the position of the Jews. The charter given by the Duke of Austria in 1244 and the laws in Bohemia, Silesia and Lithuania are based on very similar principles. According to these provisions, a Christian could not prosecute a Jew in court unless he brought up a Jewish witness. Jews were not under the jurisdiction of local judges, but were subject only to the royal or ducal court. Among themselves, they were judged in the synagogue. A Christian who killed a Jew was punished with death with the confiscation of all property. If a Christian raises his hand against a Jew, his hand will be cut off. A Christian who did not rush to help a Jew who was attacked was punished with a fine. The Jews were guaranteed duty-free trade. Their usurious operations were allowed up to 173% growth. Any violations of the religious activities of Jews were prohibited. For insulting Jewish worship, a fine was imposed, for desecrating a cemetery - the death penalty. The accusation of the murder of a Christian child by a Jew was allowed only in the presence of three Christian and three Jewish witnesses. If the court found a Jew not guilty, then the accuser was subject to the same punishment that would have been inflicted on a guilty Jew. King Sigismund II announced in 1551. that every Jew who disregards "the sentence and prohibition imposed on him by a rabbi, judge or other Jewish elders (....) will be beheaded." to which a guilty Jew would be subjected. King Sigismund II announced in 1551. that every Jew who disregards "the sentence and prohibition imposed on him by a rabbi, judge or other Jewish elders (....) will be

beheaded." to which a guilty Jew would be subjected. King Sigismund II announced in 1551. that every Jew who disregards "the sentence and prohibition imposed on him by a rabbi, judge or other Jewish elders (....) will be beheaded."

In 1616, after the crowd destroyed the ghetto in Frankfurt am Main, the leader of the outrage Fettmilch and six other ringleaders were executed by the power of the Emperor. The emperor obtained a fine of 175,919 florins on the Christian population of the city. The ghetto was placed under the direct protection of the emperor, as a sign of which a shield with the emperor's coat of arms was displayed on the gate. And in other imperial cities, the expulsion of the Jews was usually soon abolished by imperial decree.

Persecution periods generally alternated with periods when Jews, protected by the authorities, held a high position in society and had a great influence on its life. The basis of this influence has always been the same: the presence of capital. As Roth says, in the XI-XII century. v. Jews were almost the only owners of capital. Usury is most often cited as the source of Jewish capital. LN Gumilev, referring to the work of I. Shipper, points to another source - the slave trade. This statement is supported in later studies, for example, in the book by H. Trevor-Roper, which says that for a long time Jews were the main suppliers of slaves from medieval Europe to the Islamic world. The two main forms of activity of the then state: war and construction, almost entirely depended on them. So, The First Crusade became possible to a large extent thanks to their support. Aaron from Linkol-na - the largest Anglo-Jewish financier of the KhP c. - financed the construction of nine Cistercian monasteries and a large abbey at St Albans. In the time of Richard I, contemporaries compared the palaces of the Jews in London in terms of wealth with the royal ones.

There are reports of contemporaries that in France in the XII century. under Philip Augustus, the Jews were so rich that they owned more than half of Paris. The period of flourishing of Jewish communities in France was the reign of Louis the Pious. They were exempted from duties, they were allowed to have Christian slaves. The Jews monopolized the trade in wine and meat, because of them the market days were postponed from Saturday to Sunday. Jews were legally equated with Christians. In the fourteenth century. in France, they were allowed to accept any collateral against the loan, except for land. Only royal judges could judge them. In court, their oath was accepted as evidence. Charles VI banned for ten years from accepting complaints about the abuse of Jewish usurers. Under his reign VI in France, the Jews were allowed to arrest debtors, corporal punishment and the sale of all property. The old law prohibited a Christian from being sold into slavery as a mortgage to a Jew. Charles VI canceled it and only under the influence of strong popular indignation was he supposed to restore it.

On the other hand, complaints about the omnipotence of Jewish usurers overflow the medieval chronicles. It is reported about the colossal interest that the usurers took (and this is still official) - 80, 100, 170 percent per annum. During the Second Crusade, Peter of Cluny wrote: "... Jews fill their barns with fruits, cellars with wines, wallets with coins,

chests with gold and silver ... not to return acquired or stolen church utensils. What would cost a Christian his life serves a Jew for enrichment. " In France, they complain that Jews who recently arrived in Paris own half of the city. The peasant is often said to have to pay back the entire crop as interest for a loan. The German chronicler explains the many privileges of the Jews to those that the nobility is in debt to them. An article from the Hebrew Encyclopedia quotes this passage: "Don't poor Christians have to do almost everything they ask for the damned Jews? And this is only because they owe the Jews so much with burdensome, usurious interest and interest on interest, that often nothing or very few of their possessions can be called their own. " Objection, his contemporary writes: "How could the Jews cause so much misfortune and harm by usury and other financial transactions, if Christians did not help them, if Christians did not need them due to laziness, immoderate luxury and extravagance?" In the "Chronicle of the Acts of Philip Augustus" (XII century) it is said that many fell into such dependence on the Jews,

Tax collection was often in the hands of the Jews. In Spain, this has become a general rule - moreover, both in its Mauritanian and Christian parts. Thus, don Meir was the treasurer of King Alfonso X (1221-1284). In Castile, Don Fernando appointed Don Samuel in charge of collecting all taxes in 1300. Judas Abarbanel held a similar post in Seville. Alfonso XI established in 1332 a financial management system that was entirely in the hands of the Jews. In 1348 they were also entrusted with minting coins. His heir Pedro I the Cruel gave the post of treasurer to Don Samuel ha-Levi: he collected taxes, relying on the network of his castles scattered throughout the country.

The fate of the Jews in Spain can generally serve as a model for their life in medieval Europe. Jewish colonies appeared in Spain during the time of the Roman Empire. In the Visigothic kingdom, the life of the Jews was regulated by more and more cruel laws (6th century). In fact, they had the goal of exterminating the Jews as a religious community. For example, a Jew who did not convert to Christianity with his family for a year was awarded 100 lashes and skinning. Not surprisingly, the chronicles report "conspiracies of the Jews." In any case, when the Arab conquest of Spain began (VIII century), it relied on the support of the Jewish part of the population. As stated in the article of the Jewish Encyclopedia, "the advancing Arabs had to look for support, and they found it in the person of the Jews." In the captured cities, the Arabs left Jewish garrisons. Such a garrison was also in the capital (Toledo). The bulk of the Jews concentrated in the part of Spain conquered by the Arabs. At first, life here was favorable to them. They often held high positions under the caliphs: for example, Hasdai ibn Shaprut and Samuel Halevi. The life of the famous Jewish poet Yehuda Halevi and Talmudic interpreter Maimonides dates back to this era. But here, too, Jewish persecutions began, and as a result, a large number of Jews moved to the Christian states of Spain. Here they first enjoyed the patronage of Catholic kings, in many respects were equated with nobles, and had judicial autonomy until the end of the 14th century. They often held high positions under the caliphs: for example, Hasdai ibn Shaprut and Samuel Halevi. The life of the famous Jewish poet Yehuda Halevi and Talmudic interpreter Maimonides dates back to this era. But here, too, Jewish persecutions began, and as a result, a large number of Jews moved to the Christian

states of Spain. Here they first enjoyed the patronage of Catholic kings, in many respects were equated with nobles, and had judicial autonomy until the end of the 14th century. They often held high positions under the caliphs: for example, Hasdai ibn Shaprut and Samuel Halevi. The life of the famous Jewish poet Yehuda Halevi and Talmudic interpreter Maimonides dates back to this era. But here, too, Jewish persecutions began, and as a result, a large number of Jews moved to the Christian states of Spain. Here they first enjoyed the patronage of Catholic kings, in many respects were equated with nobles, and had judicial autonomy until the end of the 14th century.

Jewish literature of that time says with pride that the most influential people in the state: Joseph d'Esia, Samuel Aben-Huacar, Samuel-Benias, Moses Abudia, Samuel Levy - come from the house of David, that the house of David took a higher place in Spain. than ever in exile. About the head of the tax department, Joseph, the son of Ephraim, it was written that he was the first among the Jews and the second in the kingdom. His retinue (like the retinue of other influential Jews) consisted of the Castilian nobility. Under Henry II and John I, finance was managed by Joseph Pison, under Iago I - by Yehuda de Cavalleria, under Pedro II - by Joseph and Mosse Ravaya, etc.

At the end of the XIV century. this atmosphere of patronage gradually began to be replaced by various kinds of restrictions. Pogroms also began. The beginning was the massacre in Seville in 1391. The people, excited by the monk, rushed into the Jewish quarter, offering a choice: baptism or death. Similar persecutions swept across Spain, despite the protection accorded to the Jews by the nobility. Then baptism began to spread more and more among the Jews, and at the same time a layer of those who adopted Christianity, but secretly professing Judaism, the Marranos, appeared. The converts (convertitos) quickly took a high position in society. The Spanish historian Amador de Los Rios writes that thanks to marriages, they quickly penetrated "the highest curia, as well as into private chambers, royal assembly halls and chancellors, government agencies, and the top management of financial affairs." For example, Shlomo Ha-Levi, taking the name of Pablo de Santa Maria at baptism, he became the great chancellor, then the pope made him a legate for the entire peninsula. Towards the end of his life he became bishop of Burgos. His brother became the prosecutor of Burgos, another brother was the executor of King Henry III, another brother was a member of the royal council, the eldest son represented the kingdom of Aragon at the Constance Cathedral. Already in the fifteenth century. many noble families, up to the highest nobility, had Jewish blood in their veins.

But the Jews who preserved their religion also played a significant role. So, at the end of the 15th century. royal finances were ruled by Abarbanel and Abraham Senior, both professors of Judaism. The fusion of the highest Spanish nobility and the top of the Jewish community went so far that when in 1492 the Jews were expelled from Spain, the king's nephew was at the head of the expelled.

The highest point of Jewish influence falls on the reign of Pedro I the Cruel (XIV century), his court was called the "Jewish court". But gradually Jewish influence began

to alternate with periods of anti-Jewish measures, and then bloody persecution - like the Seville massacre of 1391. It all ended with the expulsion of Jews (professing Judaism) from Spain in 1492 and the creation of the Inquisition (in 1480), directed mainly against marrans.

Poland is another typical example. Jews began to settle there in small numbers from the 10th or 11th century. About the later period, the Jewish historian Dubnov writes:

*The 16th century is considered the "golden age", or the time of prosperity for Jews in Poland. After Spain lost its primacy in the Jewish world, Poland acquired that primacy.*

Settlements of Jews in Poland became noticeable under Casimir the Great in the 14th century. Under him, the Jews acquired a number of privileges. A local judge could hear cases of Jews only in the presence of rabbis and community leaders. The Jews acquired the right to own land and lease the estates of the nobles. The favorable position of the Jews under Casimir the Great is associated with the influence of his mistress Esterka. However, she was killed during the persecution of the Jews, which arose under his heir Louis. The strong state power that had developed under Casimir was increasingly shaken over the next two centuries. By the 16th century, which Dubnov speaks of as "gold", Poland was already a noble republic with an elected king who had only nominal power. As Dubnov says, "Polish kings patronized the Jews." In details:

*The Jews constituted a special class in Poland, ruled in internal life by their elected representatives, secular and spiritual. The affairs of the Jewish communities were in charge of the kagals, that is, community councils.*

There was a single Jewish administration, the "Council of the Four Countries", in particular, which collected all taxes from the Jews.

By the XVI century. in Poland is the development of the Talmudic tradition by Moses Psserlis and Solomon Lurie.

The weakening of the royal power and the strengthening of the power of the gentry led to the enslavement of the peasants, who had previously been free. As Shahak says - "Serfdom was indistinguishable from slavery in its pure form (...). But the worst situation was in the eastern lands of Poland (Belarus and Ukraine), inhabited and cultivated by recently enslaved peasants."

Shahak speaks in detail about the economic situation of the Jews

*Throughout Rzeczpospolita, the nobles used Jews to undermine the role and influence, and before that very relative, of the royal cities. (...) For the most part, the aristocrats put their Jewish intermediaries in the cities, thereby artificially creating conflicts.*

*But the worst situation was in the eastern regions of Poland (...). There were almost no royal cities on this vast territory. The cities were founded by landowners and were inhabited almost exclusively by Jews. Outside the cities, most Jews, of course throughout Poland, but especially in the East, were used as direct rulers and oppressors of enslaved peasants: they were tenants (managers of estates, endowed with full power). In short, in all of Poland, under the rule of the landowners (and the feudal Church, replenished exclusively by the nobles), the Jews were at the same time the direct exploiters of the peasants and almost the only townspeople. ... the peasants were subjected to particularly severe oppression under the dual rule of landowners and Jews; and it can be assumed that the latter fully used the religious Jewish laws on the attitude towards the Gentiles. As we will see in the next chapter, the application of these laws is canceled or relaxed if it can be thought to provoke dangerous hostility towards the Jews.*

Among the privileges that Jews enjoyed at that time, one can also include the fact that in the case of baptism they acquired the nobility, often of a high rank. It all ended, however, with bloody uprisings of the times of Khmelnitsky and Gaidamatchina.

In both cases - Spain and Poland - periods of prosperity and influence ended in particularly violent persecution.

Why, or at least - how did it happen? One can hope to get closer to the answer to this question by considering the accusations that were leveled against Jews in the Middle Ages. For us, some of them sound rational, others are absolutely fantastic, but for contemporaries they all, apparently, were equally significant.

Typical of the medieval spirit were Luther's statements about the Jews. Occasionally when I come across quotations from his work "On the Jews and Their Deceptions," I have long regarded them as distortions in an evil anti-Jewish spirit, they breathe such hatred - until I finally read the entire work in Luther's Collected Works. There is, for example, "Seven Faithful Advice" to German princes, where Luther proposes to destroy all synagogues and fill the ruins with tar, burn "Jewish books", force Jews to engage in only physical labor - and adds that he advises this only because of his Christian mercy, for one could completely expel them from Germany, "as in the 15th century they were expelled from Spain, in the 14th century from France and in the 13th century from England."

More specifically, we first of all meet accusations of robbing the population with the help of usury at a colossal percentage. It should be borne in mind that in the Middle Ages, the Catholic Church prohibited usury to Christians under the threat of excommunication for the laity and deprivation of dignity for priests, so that the Jews were the only ones who could legally lend money at interest. And more importantly, they had the money. We have given examples of accusations of huge usurious interest rates above.



The Jews were also accused of selling Christians into slavery to the Moors. In the VII century. the chronicler Luitprand, Bishop Agobard, and the Chalon synod on the Marne in 630 assert that the Jews emasculate Christian children and sell them to the Saracens. Of the newest historians, Trevor-Roper speaks about this side of the economic activity of the Jews.

This is followed by accusations of helping the enemies of the state. Roth himself says that in view of the persecution suffered by the Jews in the Visigothic state in Spain, it should hardly be surprising that they strongly sympathized with the Arab invasion, unless they explicitly called on the Arabs. The Spanish chroniclers state the latter. Conquering Spain, the Moors left Jewish garrisons in the cities. The Jews were accused of letting the Moors into Toledo in 965 and participating with them in the massacre of Christians, or of betraying Bordeaux to the northern pirates.

Along with this accusations, which can be characterized as rational (leaving aside the question of their fairness), absolutely fantastic ones also played an important role: first of all, in a conspiracy to exterminate Christians and for this purpose poisoning of wells during the years of the "Black Death". But more often than not, two accusations were repeated: the abduction of Christian babies and their ritual murder and the theft of the Holy Gifts in order to desecrate them. Several trials were carried out on these charges, but many more lawsuits and popular indignations took place, which ended in the murder of many Jews.

One of the earliest accusations of ritual murder (most often it was claimed that it took place on Good Friday and was a parody of the crucifixion of Christ) concerns the murder of St. William of Norwich in England in 1144. A similar charge arises in 1171 at Blois. Hugo of Lincoln in England, allegedly crucified by Jews in 1255, even became the hero of folk ballads. Other examples: the accusation of murder of a child in Bern in 1249 and then in Diessenhofen on the Rhine, as well as in other cities of Switzerland - Schaffhausen, Winterthur. In Spain in 1450, Emmanuel, the son of the physician Solomon, wishing to be baptized, described to the bishop in detail how he was present at the ritual murder. Llorente in "History of the Inquisition" gives four cases when the court of the Inquisition recognized the fact of ritual murder. In Trieste in 1474, the court considered the case of the ritual murder of a child. In Germany in the 15th century. such accusations have been raised on several occasions.

Accusations of the desecration of the Holy Gifts begin to be met since the 13th century. The persecution of Jews associated with them took place, for example, in Passau in 1478, in Brandenburg in the 15th century, in Carinthia in 1421, etc.

The overwhelming majority of modern historians consider these accusations completely fictitious. In favor of such a judgment, in any case, the fact that confessions during the trials were usually given under torture so monstrous that very few people would be able to withstand them. But, for example, the modern historian Eusebio Kolometz points to "some dark blasphemous actions" as one of the reasons that led to the fact that in the 15th century. relations between Jews and Christians in Spain were on the brink of civil

war. Sabbatini's book "Torquemada and the Inquisition" provides an abstract of the works of the Spanish historian Fidel Fit, published in 1877, on the documents of the Inquisition on the ritual murder in 1491 in Spain. The author believes that the evidence in the hands of the Inquisition was obtained without the aid of torture: by means of "decoy ducks" and cross-examination. The testimonies of the accused, interrogated in different cities, agree on the details. It is difficult to explain why all these stories should be attributed solely to the religious fanaticism of Catholics. Fanaticism was on both sides and it could lead to the most extreme excesses. In other cases, this is allowed. For example, rumors about ritual murders in the Khlyst sect were reproduced in fiction (Merezhkovsky) and did not cause the author to be accused of fanaticism.

But for our purposes it is completely irrelevant whether such accusations were even in some cases justified. It is important for us to imagine with the help of them what the image of Jewry was in the eyes of the surrounding population. And here, as in antiquity, all these variegated accusations can be reduced to one thing: Jewry was perceived as an alien, hostile and dangerous body within medieval society. There are good reasons for this assertion. One can imagine that the perception of the surrounding life by medieval Jewry was largely characterized by the same features: as an alien and hostile world. Jews lived in separate neighborhoods, the so-called ghettos, Judengasse, or Juderia. There is a widespread belief that they were driven there by force. We have already given in the previous paragraph the opposite opinion of Max Weber, the majority of historians, including Jewish ones, adhere to the same view. For example, in Spain in the XIII century. King Ferdinand provided the Jews in Seville with three parishes for residence. Then it was a privilege that was sought. As a rule, Jews were concentrated in the ghetto, so that contacts with the outside world would not interfere with the special nature of their life, would not interfere with the implementation of a complex system of prohibitions and rituals. One of the leaders of Jewish nationalism, President of the World Zionist Organization Nachum Goldman says: did not interfere with the implementation of a complex system of prohibitions and rituals. One of the leaders of Jewish nationalism, President of the World Zionist Organization Nachum Goldman says: did not interfere with the implementation of a complex system of prohibitions and rituals. One of the leaders of Jewish nationalism, President of the World Zionist Organization Nachum Goldman says:

*The ghetto has historically been a Jewish invention ...  
And to this day, Jews tend to settle in their neighborhoods, in an environment  
that makes life easier in the community.*

Jewish quarters were formed, for example, due to the fact that Jews settled around the synagogue. But later, there are also instructions from the authorities to settle Jews only in the already arisen quarters.

The whole life of Jews was subject to a complex system of religious prohibitions and rules. A huge number of objects and actions were considered "clubs", ie. impure, sinful. The outside world concealed the scattered dangers of infection with "tref", and life in the ghetto helped to avoid them. The prohibitions were so numerous and complex

that they often had to turn to experts in the Talmud in order to choose the correct, safe line of conduct. Here's one example. From the Middle Ages survived the Jewish literature "Responza", composed of the answers of especially famous rabbis to the requests of believers. There, a lot of space is given to questions of this kind: Christian workers transported a barrel of wine for a Jewish owner. As she was loaded onto the cart, some wine splashed onto the carrier's hands, and a few drops of glass back into the barrel. Has the wine become "those. sell. The same literature emphasizes the prohibition of a Jew to enter into a business partnership with a non-Jew. Later, in the 20th century, when Jewish authors more openly expressed their attitude towards this pagan world, a number of testimonies appeared about the repulsion and even hatred that it caused (we will cite some of them later). It is hard to imagine that life in the Middle Ages encouraged greater tolerance. The ideological aspect of the life of European Jewry in the Middle Ages will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. those. sell. The same literature emphasizes the prohibition of a Jew to enter into a business partnership with a non-Jew. Later, in the 20th century, when Jewish authors more openly expressed their attitude towards this pagan world, a number of testimonies appeared about the repulsion and even hatred that it caused (we will cite some of them later). It is hard to imagine that life in the Middle Ages encouraged greater tolerance. The ideological aspect of the life of European Jewry in the Middle Ages will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. which he called (we will give some of them later). It is hard to imagine that life in the Middle Ages encouraged greater tolerance. The ideological aspect of the life of European Jewry in the Middle Ages will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. which he called (we will give some of them later). It is hard to imagine that life in the Middle Ages encouraged greater tolerance. The ideological aspect of the life of European Jewry in the Middle Ages will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

As many times in the history of Jewry, we face a complex process in which it is impossible to find the "instigator", divide it into "right" and "guilty" or, as they now formulate, describe it using the "culprit-victim" scheme. But it can be imagined more concretely.

## LITERATURE

Marcus JR The Jew in the medieval world. 1975.

Roth C. The Jews in the middle ages. (Cambridge Medieval History, v. VII).

Depping GB Die Juden im Mittelalter. Hildesheim. 1974.

Abrahams Israel. Jewish life in the Middle Age. NJ, 1897.

Wilpert Paul (Hrsg). Judentum im M1ttelalter. Berlin. 1966.

Irving A. Agus. Urban Zivilisation in pge-crusade Europe. vv. I, II. NJ, 1965.

Sabatini Raphael. Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition. London. 1928.

Goldmann N. Le paradox juif. Paris 1976.

Dozy R. Histoire de musulmans d'Europe. Leyde. 1891 t. I - III.

Sago Georg. Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden im Mittelalter und der Neuen Zeit. Bd I. Frankfurt / M. 1924.

Wirth Louis. The Ghetto. Chicago. 1946.

Amador de los Rios. Historia social, politica, religiosa de las Judaios de Espana y Portugal. Madrid. 1960.

Cohn Norman. The Pursuit of the Millenium. NJ1970.

Gumilev L. N. Russia and the Great Steppe, Moscow, 1989.

Schipper I. The emergence of capitalism among the Jews of Western Europe. SPb. 1910.

Trevor-Roper H. The Rise of Christian Europe. London. 1965.

Shahak I. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Llorente J.-A. A Critical History of the Spanish Inquisition. T. T. 1.2. M. 1936.

Dubnov S.M. A Brief History of the Jews. M. 1996. (reprint of the 1912 edition).

Goldman N. La paradox juif. Paris. 1976

"Jewish Encyclopedia". SPb. 1911. T. I, articles "Autonomy" and "Agobard". Vol. II, articles "England" and "Anti-Semitism". Vol. III, "Assimilia". T.VI, "Germany". T. VIII, "Spain". T. XI "Population". T. XV "Ukraine".

"Brief Jewish Encyclopedia". Jerusalem. 1976. Vol. I, article "Autonomy", Vol. II, article "Gaidamaki".

## Chapter 4. Classical Judaism.

In the Middle Ages, a system of views was developed within Jewry, regulating both relations with the non-Jewish world and the behavior of Jews in private life and in the Jewish community. It can help you to more concretely imagine the relationship between the Jewish and non-Jewish parts of medieval society. In these principles, it is impossible to separate religious statements and specific rules of conduct. Most of them are contained in the Talmud and commentaries to it. Shahak writes that if there is a wide scope for interpretation in matters of faith, then the instructions regarding specific actions are rigidly fixed in the Talmud. At the same time, the classical (and modern orthodox) point of view is that if there is a discrepancy with the Torah, then the Talmudic text takes precedence. According to Jewish tradition, Moses told the Jews on Mount Sinai, in addition to the Torah - the Law, written down at the behest of God, some more explanations and additions, which were to be transmitted orally. After the destruction of the Temple, when the center of Jewish religious life disappeared, the rabbis began to record this oral tradition (from the 2nd to the 6th century after Christ). These records made up the Talmud. In view of its vastness and inconsistency, attempts were made several times to create more compact vaults. These are: Code of Maimonides - XII century, Code of Jacob Asher - XIII century. and the Codex of Joseph Karo called "Shulchan Aruch" - XVI century. Apparently, the worldview of Orthodox Jewry is more determined by the Talmud than by the Bible, if only because the Talmud prescribes to understand the Bible only as it interprets it. For the new time, such a role is played by "Shulchan Aruch".

Many authors and many times cited excerpts from the Talmud and "Shulchan-Aruch" fanatically hostile towards non-Jews ("goyim" or "Akum"). Here are some examples. "It is said, you are my sheep, the sheep of my flock, you are men; they call you men; Akums are not such." "The money of Akum is like a good that does not belong to anyone, and everyone who came first takes it." "Cohabitation with Akum is the same as cohabitation with livestock." "All nations, except the Jews, came from an unclean spirit and should be called cattle." "The sun illuminates, the rain fertilizes the earth only for the sake of the Jews." "A Jew is allowed to commit lawlessness towards a goy, since it is written: you must not commit lawlessness towards your neighbor, and a goy is not meant." ... "It is forbidden for the Jews to free Akum from any danger to which their life is exposed, for to save Akum means to increase the number of those who are like them." "Where does the hatred of the Jews for all other nations come from? It originated from Mount Sinai" (play on words: one of the meanings of the word Sinai is hatred. Hatred along with the Law is given on Mount Sinai).

A number of authors with an apologetic attitude towards Judaism denied the authenticity of these quotes. Self-checking is impossible for most of us here: one would have to have access to a copy of the Talmud or "Shulchan-Aruch" and be fluent in the language in which they are written. In extreme cases, you need to have a translation in your hands, in the conscientiousness of which there is confidence. Shahak confirms the rumors repeatedly expressed that the Talmud also contains a number of extremely offensive statements about Christ, Christians and gentiles in general. In particular, the

prescription to destroy, if possible, all copies of the Gospel. In the Middle Ages, in connection with this, demands were repeatedly proclaimed to destroy all copies of the Talmud. Then, says Shahak, such places began to be removed from Talmudic literature, starting from the editions of the 16th century. and the words "heathen" "Gentile", "Goy" began to be replaced by something like "Samaritan", "Egyptian" or even "Hindu". But at the same time, lists of such "exemptions" were circulated. Now, as Shahak writes, these sayings have been restored - in the ancient Jewish literature published in Israel. But he gives a number of examples where an English translation softens or completely distorts such a text.

On the other hand, a number of Jewish sympathizers argue that all quotations of this type from Talmudic literature are anti-Semitic forgeries. The most famous of those who spoke in a critical spirit is V. Soloviev. He devoted a separate article to this issue: "The Talmud and the latest polemical literature about it in Austria and Germany." It is natural to analyze his arguments first. The book by Justus "The Mirror of Jewry" is analyzed in detail in Solov'yov's article. It contains about a hundred quotes from the Talmud and "Shulchen-Aruch", characterizing, according to Justus, the hostile attitude of the compilers of these books to non-Jews. The book was published in Germany, and in the same place the Jewish community initiated proceedings against the author on charges of libel. Hebraist Dr. Ecker and influenced by his testimony, the author was acquitted. Then Ecker published the book "The Mirror of Jewry in the Light of Truth" - on this book Soloviev and relies. The fact is that Ecker reproaches Justus for incorrect quotations: for example, he combines two different quotations into one. However, Ecker just comes to the conclusion that, in essence, Justus correctly conveys the spirit of the provisions found in the Talmud. Soloviev cites Ecker's critical remarks, but adds: "whatever the critic then says does not prevent the impartial reader from making a correct judgment on all points," without informing his reader what Ecker says next. Soloviev argues that if you remove from the book of Justus "everything false, incorrect and incongruous", then "there will be seven or eight laws,

In addition, Soloviev cites a large number of quotes from the Talmud, imbued with humane and lofty feelings. But the critics of the Talmud just argue that the humane provisions of the Talmud mainly refer to Jews and are often accompanied by explanations that the "neighbor" or even the "person" they are talking about is only a Jew, while the rest are "excluded" from this statement. for they are "inhumans" and so on. Already in the Old Testament, a similar "double standard" is formulated - we gave several examples in Chapter 2.

It is precisely such quotes from the Talmud that are cited by its critics - that a number of passages in the Bible should be interpreted in this way. For example, the commandment (Leviticus 19.13 Do not offend your neighbor and do not destroy. The wages of a mercenary should not remain with you until the morning) does not apply to goyim, for "a goy is not a neighbor." It is argued that this is precisely the meaning of the words "do good" in most Talmudic texts. Thus, in the literature of the "Responza" of the early Middle Ages, the custom of giving gifts to the poor, who for this purpose bypassed rich houses on the holiday of Purim, is discussed. At the same time, sometimes non-

Jewish servants also received gifts. Rabbi Kalonim forbids this, saying that randomly distributing gifts is worse than not giving them at all.

Solovyov's article ends with a thought put into the mouth of a certain mental Jew: "One of two things: either your religion is really unrealizable, it is only an empty and arbitrary fantasy; or it is realizable and, therefore, you do not carry it out by your own ill will; In this case, before calling others to you, repent and correct yourself. " (The idea for Solovyov is old - he expressed it in his article "Jewry and the Christian Question"). But it's hard to believe that life can be summed up in such a short outline. Christianity is thus approaching Leo Tolstoy's teaching about "non-resistance to evil by force." However, Soloviev himself, in his work "Three Conversations", when, polemicizing with this doctrine of L. Tolstoy, describes the war with the Turks, he does not use such a scheme at all ("One of two ..."),

The most striking thing, perhaps, is that Soloviev avoids the main question: discussion of the authenticity of certain quotations from the Talmud. It was known about him that he spoke Hebrew (even when he was dying he read a prayer in Hebrew) and he could well express his opinion on this issue. But he does not do this, limiting himself to discussing not the Talmud, but the books of Justus and Ecker.

It seems to me, however, that even for a person who does not speak Hebrew, it is possible to form a fairly reliable opinion about the authenticity of many quotations from the Talmud. As an example, I will cite one source of quotations from the Talmud - the old book of Eisenmenger, published in 1700 (Avtop reports that for 40 years the publication of the book was banned in the Austrian Empire due to the pressure of influential Jewish financiers. In the end, the book was published in Prussia .) The whole spectrum of the above statements is there. Eisenmenger's book is not a translation of the Talmud - it is a collection of quotations such as: "Talmud about Christianity", "Talmud about other peoples", etc. However, each utterance is accompanied by an accurate reference, is given on one page in Hebrew and translated in German on the opposite. In Jewish literature, Eisenmenger's translation is usually treated as "unscientific." However, the author has nowhere come across any specific claims to this book: statements that the passage cited in it is not contained in the Talmud, or that the given translation is not correct.

But there is also quite authoritative confirmation of Eisenmenger's quotes. This is the book by Y. Kats, Professor Emeritus of the Jewish University in Jerusalem, "From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700-1933". It just begins with a discussion of Eisenmenger's book. The author acknowledges the accuracy of the Talmudic quotations in this book. At the same time, he calls the selection of quotations biased. The latter is true - out of necessity. Eisenmenger was a missionary seeking to convert Jews to Christianity. Therefore, he chose precisely the quotes, the most intolerant and fanatical, which should have alienated the reader from Judaism.

Another confirmation of the authenticity of Eisenmenger's quotes can be considered that the main provisions are repeated in Shahak's book, written from a Jewish-patriotic

position (moreover, the author received a religious education and quotes a large number of sources). According to Shahak, after the collapse of the ancient society up to 800 A.D. there are no sources describing the life of European Jewry. Sources are very rare even in the 10th century. and give some general picture only from the XII century. Then a code of laws called Halakha was formed, which was followed by the overwhelming number of Jewish communities up to the 19th century. Shahak calls this system of laws "Classical Judaism". He notes three main features of European Jewish communities in the era when this worldview took shape. 1) The Jewish agricultural population has completely disappeared. Respectively, as he says, the literature of classical Judaism is filled, in relation to agriculture and the peasants, with even greater hatred and contempt than the pagans. 2) Jewish communities served the authorities and were part of the privileged stratum of the population. He does not deny widespread poverty and anti-Jewish persecution among Jews. But despite this, "the poorest Jewish artisan, peddler, tenant, clerk lived incomparably better than the serf. Especially in European countries, where serfdom survived partially or completely until the 19th century: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland and Polish territories annexed by Russia. " 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. the literature of classical Judaism is filled, in relation to agriculture and the peasants, with even greater hatred and contempt than for the pagans. 2) Jewish communities served the authorities and were part of the privileged stratum of the population. He does not deny widespread poverty and anti-Jewish persecution among Jews. But despite this, "the poorest Jewish artisan, peddler, tenant, clerk lived incomparably better than the serf. Especially in European countries, where serfdom survived partially or completely until the 19th century: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland and Polish territories annexed by Russia. " 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. in relation to agriculture and the peasants, even more hatred and contempt than the pagans. 2) Jewish communities served the authorities and were part of the privileged stratum of the population. He does not deny widespread poverty and anti-Jewish persecution among Jews. But despite this, "the poorest Jewish artisan, peddler, tenant, clerk lived incomparably better than the serf. Especially in European countries, where serfdom survived partially or completely until the 19th century: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland and Polish territories annexed by Russia. " 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the



persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. in relation to agriculture and the peasants, even more hatred and contempt than the pagans. 2) Jewish communities served the authorities and were part of the privileged stratum of the population. He does not deny widespread poverty and anti-Jewish persecution among Jews. But despite this, "the poorest Jewish artisan, peddler, tenant, clerk lived incomparably better than the serf. Especially in European countries, where serfdom survived partially or completely until the 19th century: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland and Polish territories annexed by Russia. " 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. 2) Jewish communities served the authorities and were part of the privileged stratum of the population. He does not deny widespread poverty and anti-Jewish persecution among Jews. But despite this, "the poorest Jewish artisan, peddler, tenant, clerk lived incomparably better than the serf. Especially in European countries, where serfdom survived partially or completely until the 19th century: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland and Polish territories annexed by Russia. " 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. "the poorest Jewish artisan, peddler, tenant, clerk lived incomparably better than a serf. Especially in European countries where serfdom survived partially or completely until the 19th century: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland and Polish territories annexed by Russia ". 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. "the poorest Jewish artisan, peddler, tenant, clerk lived incomparably better than a serf. Especially in European countries where serfdom survived partially or completely until the 19th century: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland and Polish territories annexed by Russia ". 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation. 3) Total opposition to the surrounding population (excluding kings). He suggests that the persecution of Jews should be considered on a par with other lower-class movements caused by exploitation.

All the rules of the Talmud quoted above can be found in the book of Shahak. And moreover, quotations, for example, from the compiler of the first Talmudic code,

Maimonides, according to which a doctor (Jew) should not heal a pagan, even for a fee. But there is an exception (Maimonides himself was the doctor of Sultan Saladin): if the refusal can cause the hostility of the pagans, then you can only be treated for a fee. Or the statement that if a Jew had sexual intercourse with a woman, even if it was a girl of 3 years old, then the woman should be killed like an animal, because she was the reason that the Jew did a bad deed. The Jew must be punished with a whip. The claim that all non-Jews are organs of Satan. Proposals for Jews, which stipulate that "Gentiles and dogs are excluded." In particular, a description of the ritual of monthly cleansing bathing, after which an Orthodox Jewess must come home and perform a ritual intercourse with her husband. But if on the way she encounters one of the devilish creatures - a dog, a pig, a donkey or a pagan - she must return. Maimonides argues that some of the Turks, the northern nomads and the blacks, as well as "similar to them" are not human beings, but closer to animals. An instruction, passing by a non-Jewish cemetery, to curse the mother of the dead. Shahak especially emphasizes the constant hostility of Jewish sources to Christianity. So, the name of Christ is usually written with the addition: let the name of the wicked disappear. Shahak sums up: "A devout Jew from his earliest youth, from his pious pursuits, learned that pagans are like dogs, that doing good to them is a sin, etc." All this is strikingly consistent with other evidence, for example, a baptized Jew who became a priest, A. Alekseev (Shakhnovich) about his youth: "Before a Jewish youth leaves school and recognizes a Christian, he already becomes his incorrigible enemy." "As soon as a Christian approaches the house of a Jew, the children will shout: Ahoy! Ahoy! - that is, a Christian, and his wife will add: Agoy Ahezer, that is, a Christian pig is asking you." "We could not pass by the Christian church without disgust and considered it an absolute duty to spit on it, uttering the words - let this place be trampled upon, for it is unclean." That is, a Christian, and the wife will add: agoy ahezer, i.e. the Christian pig is asking you. "" We could not pass by the Christian church without disgust and considered it an imperative duty to spit on it, uttering the words - let this place be trampled, for it is unclean. " That is, a Christian, and the wife will add: agoy ahezer, i.e. the Christian pig is asking you. "" We could not pass by the Christian church without disgust and considered it an imperative duty to spit on it, uttering the words - let this place be trampled, for it is unclean. "

Shahak characterizes medieval Jewish society as "one of the most 'closed' and totalitarian in human history." It was based on the absolute subordination of the community (kagala) to its top.

Thus, it seems convincing that statements like the ones above convey the spirit of the Talmud, and at the same time the worldview of Orthodox Jewry, as it developed in the Middle Ages. This spirit of fear, hatred and arrogant contempt for the surrounding peoples could not but affect the behavior, in the entire life attitude of medieval Jewry.

Shahak defines the era of the domination of classical Judaism in Jewish communities since the 9th century. before the French Revolution, for Eastern Europe - until the XIX century, and for example, for Saudi Arabia - until the moment of writing his book - XX century.

Based on Shahak's observation that Jews in Eastern Europe as early as the 19th century lived according to the medieval way of life, we can more concretely imagine the system of values and the social structure of medieval Jewry. Just about the way of life of Jews in the 18th and 19th centuries in the "Pale of Settlement" of Russia, detailed evidence has been preserved. First of all, I mean the book by Yakov Brafman, which in many respects is consistent, but also complements and concretizes Shahak's points of view. The book draws on a lot of factual material. The author (unlike Shahak) is a Christian (according to him, he was baptized at 34), but the book has a warm attitude towards the Jewish tradition and the fate of the Jews. For example, when describing Jewish national holidays and customs: reading the Pentateuch (Aliyah), celebrating the new year (Rosh Hashana), weddings, etc.

We will give some information about the "inner closed life of the Jews" from the book of Brafman. Let us recall that Shahak believes that the type of life of medieval Jewry is not determined by the prescriptions of the Talmud, but was formed later than the writing of the Talmud - not earlier than the 8th century. A similar point of view is expressed by Brafman. In the Talmud, as he says, one can find contradictory prescriptions, and in the kahal organization they acquire a clear and unambiguous character. For example, on the important question of how obligatory the law of the state in which they live is for the Jews, the Talmud contains different judgments: a) "the royal law is obligatory for the Jew"; b) "this decree refers exclusively to issues concerning the personal benefits of the Sovereign, but the decisions of the court places can in no way be binding on the Jew" and, in conclusion, c) "

*It is forbidden (for a Jew) to sue in a non-Jewish court and in a non-Jewish court. This prohibition does not lose its force even on such issues on which non-Jewish laws are similar to Jewish ones, and even if both sides were willing to bring their case to a non-Jewish court. Anyone who violates this prohibition is a villain. This act is recognized as tantamount to blasphemy, reproach, and the laying on of hands on the entire law of Moses.*

(In elections, on the basis of state laws, representatives of the Jewish community to the state judicial seat are secretly selected by a commission of 30 representatives of the kahal.)

*After making this, so to speak, preliminary unofficial choice, all voters are obliged to stand for a legal election in favor of those two candidates, on whose side the majority of the votes in the preliminary election turned out. Clauses drawn up to prevent the Talmudic judgment from becoming weakened by our sins. They are established on a legal basis in order, God forbid, not to allow our enemies to be judges (so that the Jews do not submit their cases to a non-Jewish court; in brackets, apparently, Brafman's commentary), in order to bend the impudent disobedient in an arc and force every Jew to be obedient to the Talmudic court and law.*

Finally, the kahal concludes one of its decisions with the words:

*make the layout and establish the said fee in addition to the consent of the governor.*

The decrees of the kagals, cited in Brafman's book, paint a completely unusual form of the attitude of Jews to the property of the surrounding population. This general principle is called Hezkat Ishub. It consists in the fact that the property of the surrounding Christians is distributed by the kagal (sold) to the Jews subordinate to him. There are many acts of sales (or resale). The property right thus obtained is called khazaka. Sometimes a certain person may turn out to be such property - this right is called meropie. Examples of kagal sanctioning the rights of the Khazaki:

*... it was decided to sell to Rabbi Michel, p. R. Isaac, the right to own the parade ground and the buildings of the Christian German carpenter John, which he built on a new street opposite the houses of the architect Kramer.*

*Regarding the litigation between the representatives of the kagal and the sons of the late Arius regarding the right to own the stone shops of the bishop, the representatives of the kagal decided ...*

*By the general decision of the representatives of the kahal, it was sold to Isaac, p. R. Zeva Wolf, the right to own the stone shops located in the small bazaar and belonging to the priests of the Bonifat order.*

Sometimes the granting of the Khazaki's right to some property is accompanied by the words "from the center of the Earth to the height of heaven." As Brafman writes: "The non-Jewish residents of the kagal region with all their property are here the territory that constitutes, so to speak, the state or state property of the kagal, which he sells in parts to his Jewish residents." Brafman sees the source of this view in the Talmudic principle:

*The property of non-Jews is like a free desert.*

He quotes "one of the greatest scholars of Talmudic legislation," Rabbi Joseph Clooney, who believes that this territory is like a free lake, in which only a Jew can set up nets who have acquired this right from the kagal.

In reality, the acquirer of the Khazaki's right to, say, a certain house, receives the exclusive right to try to take possession of this house, and "by whatever means." Before he achieves this, he has the exclusive right to rent a house from its owner (considered as such in the surrounding society) and perform any business operations related to this house. The words "from the center of the Earth to the height of the sky" mean that if this owner builds one more floor over the house, then the right of the Khazaki will extend to the superstructure. In the same way, the right of meropie means the monopoly right of any economic transactions with a certain person (meropie literally means the removal of the "real" owner from his property). The Meropius Act states:

*If a person (a Jew) has a non-Jew in his exploitation, then in certain places it is forbidden for other Jews to enter into intercourse with this subject and undermine the first one; but in other places it is free for every Jew to deal with this subject: to*

*give him money on a loan, bribe and rob him, for the property of a non-Jew is the same as a Gefker (free) and whoever takes possession of him before, it belongs to him.*

Kagal strictly and in detail regulated the life of the community he headed. (What Shahak calls a "totalitarian society.") This also included religious precepts, such as Sabbath observance. Moreover, Shahak reports that sometimes the administration of the corresponding state took over the supervision: for example, in Spain, Poland, Austria. For example, Rabbi Moshe Zofer from Presburg (now Bratislava, then in Austria) wrote: "If I find out in Presburg that a Jewish merchant dared to open a shop on a holiday, I send a gendarme to take him to prison." In ch. III was given a decree of the Polish king of the 15th century.

The kagal also regulated the law of the Khazaks and the Meropie. But so are many of the details of a more ordinary life, For example, who can be invited to a feast. So, according to Brafman, on the occasion of circumcision, the kagal allowed to invite:

*Two neighbors on both sides and three living on the opposite side of the street.*

Or:

*Whoever, by marrying a son or giving a daughter in marriage, arranges a wedding outside our city, it is completely forbidden to invite anyone to a feast, and all residents of the city are forbidden in such cases to send droshe geshenke (wedding gifts) to newlyweds.*

Moreover:

*Under the canonical herem (curse - see below; I.Sh.), it is forbidden for shamoshim (synagogue ministers) to call for a circumcision or wedding feast according to the register, which will not be previously revised by the ehod of the meshamosh gakgil (one of the city notaries) and is not certified by his signature, that the list is compiled according to the above rules.*

And a lot of prescriptions regarding who can be treated with what, about inviting musicians, etc.

Kagal allowed or forbade this or that Jew to settle in a certain city. He could even, as a punishment, prohibit a certain Jew from cohabitation with his wife (for this it was necessary to prevent the wife from taking part in the ritual monthly ablution, without which marital relations became illegal).

Kagal imposed certain taxes (for example, the so-called box tax associated with the sale of kosher meat). Other income came from the sale of Hazaki or Meropie law. Thus, large funds were concentrated in the hands of the kagal, which were used to bribe the

administration and to help the Jews subordinate to the kahal (which will be discussed below).

The fulfillment of all the instructions of the kahal was ensured by the Talmudic court, which was called bet-din. The body of Talmudic laws says about him:

*Any bet-din who has not even received confirmation from the authorities of the land of Israel, if he notices that the people are indulging in debauchery, has the right to sentence to death, subject to monetary penalties and other various punishments.*

Bet-din can proclaim herem (curse) to the guilty person "to exclude him from all of Israel," that is, to appeal to other kagals with an appeal to publicly announce daily:

*that his bread is the bread of a non-Jew, his wine is the wine of "nonsekh" of idolatry, the vegetables (belonging to him) are defiled, his books are considered the books of magicians.*

The calls follow:

*cut off his tsitsa (threads tied to the camisole on the basis of the dictum of the Pentateuch). Tear off a mezuzah for him (a scroll nailed to the door); you must not eat or drink with it; should not circumcise his son, not teach his children the law, not bury the dead from his family, not accept him into fraternities, either to charities or to others; the cup he empties must be rinsed out and generally treated like every (nahri) non-Jew.*

Herem's formula itself contains calls:

*Curse him by the mouth of a great, strong and terrible God. May the misfortune of God hasten to him. Creator, consume and destroy him; God the Creator! Crush him; God the Creator! Conquer him.*

More specifically, a number of measures are listed to "bend into an arc" a rebellious Jew bet-din, in particular:

*The apostate is completely excluded from society and brotherhood.  
If someone has entered into an engagement agreement with the disobedient, then the other party is released from this obligation.  
If the disobedient is a craftsman, then it is forbidden to order work from him under heavy sherry.  
It is allowed to publish in the synagogue that the apostate ate clubs (that is, food forbidden for a Jew according to the Talmud) or violated fasting, etc., to confirm this with false witnesses and subject him to punishment for this.  
And it goes without saying that at the fateful hour his misfortune will break out over him.*

To implement such measures, a so-called "secret pursuer" is elected, about which it is said:

*The secret persecutor must confirm with the most solemn oath that he will not spare anyone in the world, but will support the Talmudic court by all possible means and measures according to the instructions given to him. In addition, the secret pursuer affirms with a solemn oath that he will never reveal to anyone in the world that he was once a secret pursuer.*

According to the "Brief Jewish Encyclopedia", now the Bet - Din court network covers Israel.

Shahak writes that in Poland the kagal could sentence a criminal to death, and especially painful one: to be screwed to death.

He himself considers Nicholas I an "anti-Semite" who issued a number of laws "against Jews." But, he writes:

*maintaining "order" in his empire, he prevented the execution of Jews by order of the rabbis - while in Poland until 1795 it was considered "permissible." "Official" Jewish history condemns this king on two counts, for example, in the late 1830s. one "holy rabbi" (tzadik) in a place in Ukraine sentenced to execute a heretic by boiling him in boiling water. A Jewish contemporary of the events, setting out them, reports with bewilderment and horror that the attempt to "give a paw" to the officials did not reach the goal, and not only the executors, but the holy man himself were severely punished.*

The whole society, as Braffman describes it, is extremely hierarchical. Braffman divides it into two layers, which he calls "patricians" and "plebeians." All decrees and laws are imbued with extreme disdain for the "plebeians". The "patricians" are also hierarchically organized. Belonging to this class and place in it is determined mainly by wealth. This is evidenced, for example, by the decree:

*The members of the asif (general meeting) are elected persons who participate in the expenses of the city. Representatives, foremen and other members of the kagal administration are elected from among these members.*

And we come across a series of decisions granting a certain privileged status to a certain person called a "rich man" or even for a precisely specified payment to the kagal. However, there is another way to change your place in the hierarchy: studying the Torah and Talmud. In many situations, the "Talmud haham", that is, the "Talmud expert", occupies a privileged position.

The kahal administration is created on the basis of elections, so Braffman justifiably speaks of a "Talmudic municipal republic." But the suffrage is very narrow, sometimes

limited to a few dozen people - this can be seen from a number of documents. In fact, it was a "patrician republic".

It is difficult to establish from the summary of Brafman's documents what the connection is between the different kagals. In any case, some documents contain decisions on cases concerning the whole province. Perhaps there was one case in which we can talk about the united action of all the kagals of Russia. We are talking about the investigation of the situation of peasants and Jews in Belarus, undertaken by Derzhavin under Paul I and Alexander I (only a short time before that Russia was faced with the fact that among its subjects there was a large number of Jews). In connection with the proposals made by Derzhavin, Gessen writes about "an extraordinary meeting of kagal deputies in Minsk in 1802". Derzhavin himself writes that he received information according to which "all the kagals" collected 1 million rubles to oppose his proposals. and even "want to encroach on his life" - which again indicates some kind of organization. But this aspect of the activity of the "Talmudic republic" is apparently unknown.

In conclusion, it should be mentioned that, although the kagal strictly and in detail controlled the life of the community, he also took care of the needs of its members. The documents collected by Brafman refer to the loans that the qagal made available to individuals; about the midwives he kept; on the issue of a dowry to poor brides; about the "ransom of Jewish prisoners" (apparently, the release, illegally, of Jews arrested by the authorities); about collecting alms for the poor in Palestine. It really was a totalitarian society (as Shahak characterizes it), moreover, of a "paternalistic type" - of course, if we mean only relations between community members.

Based on Shahak's remarks, it can be assumed that Brafman's book paints, in general terms, a picture of the life of medieval Jewry during the era of the domination of "Classical Judaism." Hesse accuses the book of being hostile to Jewry. I didn't get that impression. Although Brafman converted to Christianity, he clearly describes many features of Jewish life with a warm feeling. But the book is filled with a protest against the power of the kagal (or rather the top, consisting of "patricians"), "the power of the Jew over the Jew."

Goldschmidt's German translation of the Babylonian Talmud contains the following story:

*One of the disciples asked Rabbi Kahane if you had heard what "Mount Sinai" meant? He answered the mountain. On which a miracle happened. Then it should have been called Mount Nizay - Rather, a mountain. Has become a good sign for Israel. Then oa should have been called Nora Simnay. Then he sent the disciple to other rabbis. They said What does Mount Sinai mean? Mount, on which hatred of other nations descended. Rabbi Yose ben Hanina said this too It has five names Qing desert, where examples were given, the Kadesh desert, in which Israel was consecrated the Kedemot desert, where the beginning of the Paran desert was told to him, where they bred, the Sinai desert, where hatred of*



*the peoples of the world descended ... How is it actually called - Horeb. This contradicts r. Abakha, for r. Abakhu said that the real name is Mount Sinai, and Horeb is called only because*

A chain of similar teachings from the Talmud and commentaries to it, as well as information that has come down to us about the real life of Jewish communities (kagals), outline one concept that characterizes the attitude towards gentiles and foreigners. For example, it is argued that there are 17 "peoples" in the world, each of which is ruled by a special "angel". This "angel" is the "god" of the respective people, but at the same time it is the "devil" or "angel of death". All of them are ruled by the main angel of death - Samael - who is at the same time the "god" of the sons of Edom (Christians). Christ is called "Dead", the priest's clothing is "the garment of death," and so on. In other words, Jews are the only ones alive among the world of the dead, they live surrounded by the dead or evil spirits ("peoples of the world" come from an unclean spirit). The picture is similar to "Viy" by Gogol, where Khoma Brut is also surrounded by evil spirits trying to drag him away, and the strict precepts of the Law and the Talmud form something like a magic circle with which Khoma Brut tried to protect himself from the evil spirits rushing to him. Such a sense of life could not fail to cause a somewhat symmetrical reaction in the surrounding population.

But so often the fate of a craftsman or a peasant was in the hands of a Jewish usurer. Sabbatini, for example, says that in Portugal until the present time (XX century) the word "Jew" was used as a designation of cruelty - if a child beat a dog, the parents shouted: "Do not be a Jew." The same experiences were preserved in the works of great writers - in the image of Shylock in Shakespeare and "The Jew of Malta" in Marlowe. All this makes the hostility of the indigenous population towards the Jewish communities more understandable, the persecutions described above - no matter how fantastic from our point of view the reasons were explained at that time. There was a feeling of incompatibility between Jewry and Christian society. Their mutual repulsion made these two worlds more and more separate. But at the same time, it was impossible for them to completely isolate themselves to each other, since they were tied by an indissoluble chain of financial and economic relations. Apparently, this process of mutual repulsion, anger and isolation intensified throughout the Middle Ages and reached its maximum just at the time when, unexpectedly, the Jews began to play an increasing role in the life of European peoples.

## LITERATURE

Das 40 Jahr von der Juden mit Arrest bestrikt gewesen, nunmehr aber durch Autoritaet eines Hohen Rechts-Vicagiats relaxirte Johan Andgeae Eisenmengers Entdecktes Judenthum. Gedruckt im Jahr nach Christi Geburt 1700.

V.S.Soloviev. Collected Works. St. Petersburg. 1911. Volume six, Volume four.

Shahak I. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Katz J. From Prejudice to destruction. Anti-semitism 1700-1933. Harvard. 1970.

Alekseev A. Conversations of an Orthodox Christian from the Jews with converts from his congregation. Novgorod. 1875.

Brafman Yakov. The book of the kagala. Materials for the study of Jewish life. Vilna 1869.

Gessen Yu. History of the Jewish people in Russia. vol. 1 Leningrad 1925.

"Brief Jewish Encyclopedia". T. I, article "Beth - din".

Der Babylonische Talmud. Nach der ersten zensurfreien Ausg. Goldschmidt, Lazarus. Berlin, 1929.

## **Chapter 5. Khazaria.**

The Jewish diaspora, as a factor influencing other civilizations, arose in antiquity. Since then, it has shown itself in a huge range: in Byzantium, Western Europe, the Islamic world, Latin America, etc. (even in China). We have selected in our presentation those episodes that, at least indirectly, had an impact on our country. Here we will give a summary of the views of historians on one such episode, which was undoubtedly connected with our history, But how much it only touched on the history of Ancient Russia or was, at one time, one of its key moments - historians argue about this. We are talking about the Khazar Kaganate in the era from the 7th to the 10th century. R.Kh. LN Gumilev calls the then historical situation a "zigzag of history". Indeed, it has no analogues in history, it somehow gets out of the big picture. But after all, it may repeat itself,

Much has been written about the history of Khazaria. Since this story unfolded within the confines of present-day Russia, most of the historical writings were created in Russia. If we talk about general reviews, these are the books of M.I. Artamonov, S.A. Pletneva, A.N. Gumilyov and the works of many other authors. Most of those who wrote on this topic note the fundamental character of M.I. Artamonov's work "The History of the Khazars". We will begin by presenting the main points of this book.

Khazars are a people of Turkic origin. The Khazar state arose in the 7th century. as a result of the collapse of the East Turkic Kaganate. But the sources mention the Khazars since the 6th century. The territory of Khazaria was then made up of the steppes from the Urals to the Volga delta and further to the Caucasus, the northern Black Sea region and part of the Crimea. At one time it also claimed the Transcaucasia. In the first half of the 8th century. Khazaria fought with the Arabs. The Arabs conquered the Khazars and forced their kagan to accept Islam. But as a result of the turmoil within the Islamic world (the replacement of the Umayyad caliphate by the Abbasids), the Arabs were unable to maintain dominance over the Khazaria. A balance was established: the Arabs no longer tried to conquer the Khazars, and the Khazars did not try to conquer Transcaucasia. It was generally an era of stabilization (end of expansion) of Islam.

In the VIII century. Itil, located in the Volga delta, became the capital of Khazaria. The population of the country consisted mostly of nomads, it included the entire Black Sea steppe up to the Dnieper. But a noticeable place was occupied by farmers: the inhabitants of Taman, the lower reaches of the Kuban and Don, the shores of the Azov Sea, the lands between the Donets and the middle Don.

The settlements of Khazaria, especially Itil, were convenient transshipment bases for caravan trade between the Far East and the Iranian-Arab world and further - Europe. Since the VI century. Intensive Jewish immigration took place in Khazaria. The first impetus was an amazing event - a grandiose revolution of a radical "communist" character that swept Iran. This movement of "Mazdakis", followers of Mazdak, preached a community of property and wives. At one time, the teaching was supported by the king, Kavad I. Only under his heir, Khosroe I, was it defeated. The Jewish community of

Iran (one of the most influential in the world) joined the Mazdakites. As a result, after the defeat of the movement, Iranian Jews were persecuted along with other Mazdakis. The exarch (spiritual leader) of the Jews in Iran, Matr Zutra, was executed, and many Jews fled to the Caucasus, in the areas that then belonged to the Khazars. This first wave of emigration was later joined by others, caused by the persecution of the Jews in Byzantium, during the reign of Heraclius in the 7th century. and Leo the Isaurian in the VIII century, as well as, probably, and economic interests.

On the verge of the 8th and 9th centuries in Khazaria, a coup took place, as a result of which Judaism became the "state religion". But this does not mean that the entire population has adopted this religion. On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of the local population retained their old beliefs. But power passed into the hands of the ruling stratum, which consisted of the descendants of Jews who immigrated to Khazaria and the Khazar nobility converted to Judaism (as well as, apparently, children from mixed marriages). First, Judaism was adopted by the Bek or King Obadiya and his inner circle. Then, as the Arab historian says, "Jews from different Islamic countries and from Rome began to flock to him" (ie Byzantium). A Khazar source says: "He straightened the kingdom and established the faith in the proper way and according to the rule. He built houses of meeting and houses of teaching and gathered the wise men of Israel, gave them silver and gold, In fact, the country was ruled by a king (bek) of Jewish origin. His title was passed down from father to son. In fact, the country was ruled by a king (bek) of Jewish origin. His title was passed down from father to son.

This system of power was established after an era of civil wars that lasted for several decades. Konstantin Porphyrogenitus writes about this era: "When they were separated from their power and an internecine war broke out, the first part prevailed and some of them (the rebels) were killed, others fled and settled with the Turks (Hungarians) in the present Pechenezh land." Obadiah himself and both of his sons, Hezekiah and Manasiah, apparently died in the struggle. Power passed to Obadia's brother Hanukkah.

Trade duties became an increasingly significant part of the Khazarian budget. These capitals paid for the mercenary army, which held power. The army consisted mainly of Turkic soldiers, but was led by a Jewish commander. In case of defeat, the soldiers were subject to execution, the military leader - confiscation of property. It was this mercenary army that ensured the victory in the civil war: "The Jewish government acquired a mercenary army and became independent of the people." "A significant part of the Khazar population was exterminated." The new government was established by the middle of the 9th century.

In the IX century. the power of Khazaria extended to the East European steppes and the adjacent northern regions occupied by the Slavs. "The Tale of Bygone Years" reports under 884 that the Khazars were paid tribute to the glade, northerners, Vyatichi, Rodimichi. In the I half of the X century. the Khazar grandee Pesach, according to a Jewish source, defeated the army of the Rus and began a war against the Russian prince Helga. He forced the Rus to oppose Byzantium. The same document says: "It was then that the Rus became subordinate to the Khazar authorities." Artamonov

believes that "an action against Byzantium" implies Igor's campaign against Constantinople, which ended in failure. However, he denies "the subordination of Rus to the Khazars", believing that this is an alliance that provided the rear of the Rus for the duration of the campaign.

In this episode, the history of Khazaria is crossed with the history of our country. Here a more radical position is taken by L.N. Gumilev (former student of Artamonov). He considers the Passover campaign the beginning of the long subordination of Rus to the Khazars. Since in the X century. Khazaria fought with Byzantium for influence in Eastern Europe, then he explains the campaigns of Oleg and Igor to Constantinople as a result of a more general union of Vikings and Jewish communities, which had a common European character. From his point of view, the Viking campaigns, both in Western Europe and in the East, were financed by Jewish merchants. The Vikings sold captured slaves to them. Gumilev writes:

*Then the isolated principality of the Kiev Varangians became a vassal of the community of Khazar Jews, which used the Rus and Slavs in wars with Christians and Shiite Muslims.  
Already at the beginning of the X century. the Russian fleet operated in the Caspian Sea against the enemies of the Khazar king. Obviously, the Kiev princes began to supply the Khazar king with "blood tribute."*

For example, he makes the following argument: the Khazars used Arab dirgems as a coin. After 900 dirgems appear in the hoards of the Russian land. Moreover, this is not war booty, since the chronicles do not speak of any victories.

*This is a payment for the blood of the Slavic-Russian heroes, shed for the sake of other people's interests.*

The coup in relation to Russia with Khazaria took place after the murder of Igor by the Slavs, when the Slavs or the noble Scandinavians from the circle of the Pskovite Olga came to power. This happened in 944. This concept presupposes a very important era of Khazar domination over Russia, which preceded the coup. Only after the murder of Igor did the spread of Christianity in Russia intensify again (this was tantamount to the strengthening of the influence of Byzantium). The Khazar king Joseph could not do anything in response to this coup, since a number of crisis phenomena - from China to France - dealt a heavy blow to the Khazar trade and undermined the basis of power. In 957 Olga was baptized in Constantinople, which meant an open transition of Russia to the side of Byzantium against the Khazars. In 964 Svyatoslav began military operations against the Khazars. Perhaps, an alliance with Byzantium helped to neutralize at this time constant enemies - the Pechenegs. While the Khazar army was waiting for him in the steppes, Svyatoslav moved to the Oka, the Rus cut down the boats, went down the Volga and in 965 took the capital of Khazaria Itil by storm.

The political domination of the Khazars was broken, but Khazaria, apparently, remained a dangerous rival of Russia for a long time. Already the son of Svyatoslav, Vladimir,

undertook a campaign against the Khazars and imposed a tribute on them - according to Artamonov, in 985. Even in the next generation, the son of Vladimir, Yaroslav the Wise, in the first half of the 11th century, fought with his brother Mstislav, who relied on an army of Khazars and kosogs. But, as Gumilyov says, the economically influential Jewish community in Kiev survived for another century and a half. Its influence began to grow when it was joined by many Jews of Western origin who migrated from Germany through Poland. An intensive slave trade was in the hands of this community. Slaves were mined in the Polovtsian raids and sold to the Egyptian Caliphate through the Crimea, where there was another strong Jewish community in Chersonesos (Korsun). It was then that the martyr St. Evstrat. As Gumilyov writes, in Kiev

*trade and crafts gradually passed into the hands of the Jews, since each of them was helped by the community, while Russian merchants and artisans acted at their own peril and risk.*

But after the death of Prince Svyatopolk II in 1113, riots broke out in Kiev. The people first plundered the houses of the deceased prince's inner circle, and then - the Jewish colony. Such a picture is painted by Tatishchev. The Ipatiev Chronicle says that the houses of the Jews were plundered. The boyars asked Vladimir Monomakh to accept the princely throne. Monomakh expelled all Jews from the Russian land. If returned, the law refused to provide for their life and property.

This picture of the long-term subordination of Rus to the Jewish Khazaria and Jewish economic influence was supported by V.V. Kozhinov, relying on completely different arguments related to the history of the Russian epic and literature of Ancient Rus.

Analyzing both the content and the distribution area of the epics, he comes to the conclusion that they reflect not the opposition to the Mongol yoke (attributed to the era of St. Vladimir), not the struggle against the steppe (Polovtsy or Pechenegs), but the struggle against the rule of the Khazars. The most striking argument here is the epic "Ilya Muromets and Zhidovin". Another cornerstone of his argumentation is the appeal to the "Word of Law and Grace" by Hilarion of Kiev. This is probably the oldest (strikingly powerful) work of Russian literature, indeed, is some kind of mystery. The pathos that permeates it is the opposition of the Old and New Testaments, Judaism and Christianity, the Grace of the New Testament, which abrogates the Law of the Old Testament. Indeed, it is not clear why this particular problem would have turned out to be so burning urgent in Kiev in the 11th century. Usually (although little was written on this topic at all), the explanation was given that the opposition of the Old and New Testaments in the Lay is only an allegory expressing the opposition of the long-Christian Constantinople and the recently baptized Rus, that this is the struggle of Rus for spiritual independence from the Greek Church. But it is completely incomprehensible why Hilarion had to resort to this Aesopian language, why he could not express his thought in more direct words (it is usually assumed that he relied on the support of Prince Yaroslav the Wise). Kozhinov offers a simpler solution: there is no Aesopian language here, it is absolutely literal about the opposition of Russia, which adopted the religion of the New Testament, to a certain force based on the Old Testament. This

force is the Khazars, who not so long ago had their garrison in Kiev and are modern, economically powerful, Jewish community of Kiev. This he confirms with the following, for example, a quote:

*And while the world is standing, do not lead us to adversity of temptation, do not deliver us into the hands of strangers, so that your city will not be called captive.*

Kozhinov also draws attention to the fact that Hilarion's Lay was interpreted as a reflection of the confrontation between Russia and Khazaria, one of the greatest Russian historians MN Tikhomirov. In his work "Philosophy in Ancient Rus", he strongly objects to the interpretation of the "Lay" as a veiled polemic with the Patriarchate of Constantinople - citing a number of places where the subsidiary role of the Russian Church, its succession from Byzantium, is emphasized. Further, citing a quote from the "Lay":

*And the lake of the Law dried up, but the gospel fountain was flooded, and covering the whole earth, it overflowed before us,*

Tikhomirov writes:

*In these words of Hilarion is the opposition of the Khazar kingdom of Kievan Rus. The dried up lake is the Khazar kingdom, the flooded source is the Russian land.*

And commenting on the quote:

*the light of the moon departed when the sun shone ... And the night cold disappeared when the sun's warmth warmed the earth,*

Tikhomirov says:

*For a contemporary, hints of Hilarion were understandable, what he considers to be cold and warm at night ... This is a hint that Yaroslav, who relied on Christian Russia, defeated Mstislav, who acted with the help of the Pechenegs and Khazars, among whom the Jewish faith was widespread.*

Given the paucity of sources that have survived from that era, about 1000 years ago, their interpretation is necessarily arbitrary. It is in the nature of "versions" and facts confirming them. I have presented one such "version" - relatively speaking, the version of the "Khazar yoke". Of course, it is not generally accepted. For example, in the article by V.V. Kozhinov, to which we referred, authors who objected to this concept are also cited.

One way or another, but the history of Khazaria turned out to be connected with the fate of our country. At least in view of the parallels between the Soviet Union in the first post-revolutionary decades and ancient Khazaria. The power of the Jewish elite over the

aborigines, as it developed in Khazaria, is precisely the accusation that its enemies threw down to the communist regime. (And, unfortunately, such parallels sometimes developed on a very primitive and tendentious level.) In any case, the Khazar topic in the Soviet Union was "inconvenient", if not downright dangerous for a long time. For example, L.N. Gumilev told me that the book of M.I. Artamonov, to which we have referred more than once, could not be published for more than ten years (a summary of it was published 25 years earlier than the full text). In this book, Khazaria was first shown as one of the "superpowers" Eastern Europe IX-X centuries Because of its connection with the Khazar "problem" or directly because of its anti-Judaist orientation, Hilarion's "Word" was also "inconvenient" for almost the entire time of the communist regime. For example, the multivolume edition "Monuments of the Literature of Ancient Rus" begins with an introductory article by Acad. Likhachev "The Greatness of Ancient Literature". In this article, "The Word" of Hilarion is mentioned as one of the most significant and "one of the first works of Russian literature." But in the edition itself "Slovo" was not published. And in general, apparently, was not reprinted from 1917 to the mid-80s. I remember that I myself got acquainted with this work from the publication with the encrypted title "The Philosophical Heritage of Hilarion of Kiev" (by which one cannot guess, that we are talking about the publication of the source). Later, the well-known philosopher A. Gulyga admitted that he generally learned about the existence of the Lay from a German Slavist and was first introduced to the work by its German translation! I remember how in the 80s, for an article devoted only to the philosophical and literary analysis of the Lay, the radio station "Liberty" accused V.V. Kozhinov of "anti-Semitism." This is how different centuries and different millennia are intertwined in our history.

## **LITERATURE**

Artamonov M. I. "History of the Khazars". L., 1962. Reprinted: St. Petersburg. 2001.

Artamonov MI "Essays on the ancient history of the Khazars". L., 1936.

Gumilev L.N. "Ancient Russia and the Great Steppe". M., 1989.

V.V. Kozhinov At the heroic outpost. M., 1993.

V.V. Kozhinov "The Creativity of Hilarion and the Historical Reality of His Epoch". Almanac of bibliophile, issue 26, M., 1989.

Tikhomirov M.N. "Russian culture of the X-XVIII centuries". M., 1968.

Likhachev DS "The greatness of ancient literature". Literary monuments of Ancient Russia. XI - early XII century M., 1978.

Pletneva S. Khazars. M., 1986.

Pletneva S. Nomads of the Middle Ages. Search for historical patterns. M., 1982.



## Chapter 6. The role in the development of capitalism.

The genesis of modern capitalism (and, in particular, the role of Jews in it) was the subject of detailed research by Werner Sombart. Capitalism presupposes capital, and capital, Sombart argues, in the late Middle Ages and early modern times, was largely in the hands of the Jews. He cites testimonies from many authorities.

Cromwell, Colbert, the burgomaster of Antwerp, the city foreman of Bordeaux, the Senate of Venice - all agree that the Jews have great wealth, the attraction of Jews contributes to the growth of the economy in the era of emerging capitalism, their expulsion is a decline. The expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula was characterized by contemporaries as an "exodus of capital." Contemporaries often say that "Jews bring money into the country" - and this was the first prerequisite for the development of capitalism.

Indeed, according to Sombart, the wealth of the Jews was exceptionally great, much greater than is usually believed. We have cited in one of the previous paragraphs a number of testimonies concerning the Middle Ages. But the same is true of later times. In the XV-XVIII centuries. Dutch Jews, mostly from the Iberian Peninsula, were famous for their wealth. Baron Belmonte, heer de Pinto, heer d'Acosta were among the richest merchants and financiers in Holland. They owned the most splendid palaces in The Hague and Amsterdam, which were especially striking when compared with the houses of the thrifty Dutch. In France they said "rich as a Jew." Sombart cites especially rich material on Germany. For example, in Frankfurt am Main, among the wealthy people with an income of more than 15,000 florins, Jews were in 1593 - 7.5%, in 1607 - 7.5%, in 1618 - 20%.

But much more original is Sombart's thoughts on the *character* of Jewish participation in the development of Western European capitalism. He believes that the Jews created the preconditions for the development of modern capitalism by destroying the patriarchal principles of the "traditional" society. As their role in economic life increases, more and more complaints are heard from all sides. They are accused of "depriving the inhabitants of the country of food." The complaints are strikingly stereotyped and numerous: from England, France, Germany, Sweden, Poland ... Usually Jews are accused of "cheating". But mainly not formal offenses are meant, but the destruction of customs, moral norms in the field of trade - traditions that have developed in Christian society.

Here it is necessary to present a summary of Sombart's general views on the development of capitalism. Actually, "capitalism" is a very vague concept. A number of prominent historians - Eduard Meyer, Max Weber, MI Rostovtsev - claim that the main elements that make up capitalism: capital, wage workers, the market, production for sale, etc. - existed in various societies: Babylon, ancient Greece, Rome, etc. They, in principle, could create a variety of combinations, and only in Western Europe and the United States did they form into some completely special society, unlike anything else that has existed in History. It was his origin and analysis that Sombart dealt with. He

divides the development of capitalism into two phases, which he calls "early capitalism" and "highly developed capitalism." The latter interests him, and in its development in a very specific direction, he believes, the Jews played a decisive role. It began to dominate from the 19th century, but several centuries before that, certain of its features were being developed.

Sombart sees the essence of "highly developed capitalism" in the fact that man loses his role as the goal of the economic process, as "the measure of all things." New "individuals" are being created: trusts, enterprises - and their relations, their interests, and not the relations and interests of real people, dominate economic life. For example, under early capitalism, an entrepreneur set himself quite definite life goals: to get rich, to acquire an estate, a house, etc., and having achieved these goals, he left economic and economic activities, and it was this behavior that was perceived by everyone as "normal", "reasonable." Under developed capitalism, the only goal is the profitability and income of the enterprise, and these goals have no limit, the process becomes endless.

The ever-increasing rate of changes in economic life reaches such a limit in developed capitalism that the tradition, broken by each specific change, does not have time to be restored. As a result, everything organic, naturally grown, based on the experience of mankind is alien to the capitalist enterprise. It is purely rationalistically constructed, it is an artificial mechanism. Specifically, this is done through a process that Sombart calls "the subordination of economic life to commercial transactions." Promissory notes, securities, the stock exchange give developed capitalism an anonymous, impersonal character. If earlier, for example, debt had the character of a relationship between two specific people, in addition to the monetary side, it included a feeling of gratitude, then in the form of a bill it breaks away from human relations, completely loses its personal character.

The worldview that emerged in the Middle Ages and preserved in early capitalism proceeded - taking agriculture as a model - from the idea of a "plot" from which a person has the right to "feed". It could also be a certain area of activity, which was guarded, for example, by guilds and workshops. In this regard, all methods aimed at making a profit at the expense of another - an encroachment on his "site" were considered morally unacceptable. For example, advertising or competition with lower prices, especially selling below cost, to capture markets. The use of machines was often rejected as they could deprive many of their jobs. All such behavior was considered "unchristlich". The basis was the idea of a "fair price", which would enable the manufacturer to maintain the traditionally established standard of living. Striving for more by raising prices or increasing the size of activities was generally considered immoral and pointless. In this regard, the working time was limited, there were many holidays (up to 1/3 of the year), people were in no hurry. The traditional traits of a business person were considered slowness, gravity; they said that idlers were in a hurry and fuss.

Highly developed capitalism destroys these "patriarchal" traits. Moreover, the antithesis of almost each of them is among its most characteristic features that ensure its fabulous

productivity: unlimited competition, freedom of trade, advertising, the principle of "time is money" ... obeys the interests and logic of the development of "organizations", loses a sense of his significance, meaningfulness of his life. "Capitalism is the deconcretization of the world, reducing it to the abstract principle of money; the destruction of concreteness, diversity," Sombart formulates. Capitalism achieves productivity that people of previous centuries could not even dream of, replacing living human labor and man himself with a machine,

It was these new features, according to Sombart, that the Jews introduced into economic life. He analyzes in detail the complaints that are being handed out to Jews.

Everybody complains in the same way: they violate the delineation of trade areas by guild. This is followed by complaints about the artificial lowering of prices (trading at a loss in order to capture the market, dumping). Finally, they complain that Jews are luring customers, catching their hand in the street, decorating the windows of their shops - all this was then considered dishonest and at the same time created the foundations of free competition, advertising, "contact with the consumer" - the main features modern capitalist economy. Sombart cites many examples of advertisements for Jewish traders that were innovative and challenging at the time. Back at the beginning of the 19th century. it was considered a "Jewish principle" that a fast turnover with less income is more profitable than a slower one, albeit with a higher income. It was believed that Christians cannot apply this principle. At the same time, it forms the economic basis of the ever-growing pace of life characteristic of our era.

Sombart believes that the Jews also laid the foundation for the subordination of economic life to commercial operations, which he considers one of the main features of developed capitalism. The Jews created a promissory note and a stock exchange. Sombart associates the introduction of the bill into economic life with the need for secrecy and anonymity in the financial transactions of Jews, who were often persecuted. Indeed, when the Jews were expelled from Spain and Portugal, they were forbidden to take gold and money with them, but soon immigrants from the Iberian Peninsula were among the first wealthy people in Europe. The first bill of exchange known in history was issued, as Sombart says, in 1207 by Simon Ruben. But it is much more important that in many cities (for example, Venice in the 16th century) the bill business was entirely in the hands of the Jews.

Sombart cites a lot of evidence about the leading role of Jews on the stock exchanges of Holland, London, Germany (for example, at the beginning of the 19th century, in Berlin, out of four chairmen of the stock exchange, two were Jews, and out of 23 elders - 10, not counting the baptized). Even the first and most striking description of the exchange belongs to Isaac Pinto, a Jewish financier from France (XVIII century).

Finally, thanks to their international connections, the Jews contributed to the denationalization of economic life: the interests of not only specific people, but also states began to subordinate to the interests of international trusts and banking houses. A typical example of such an international banking house was the bank created

by Amschel Rothschild. In the XIX century, his sons headed banks in the largest cities of Europe: Nathan in London, James in Paris, Solomon in Vienna, Karl in Naples, Anselm in Frankfurt.

Of course, the dispersal of Jews contributed to the internationalization of economic activity. Their isolation within the country in which they lived made the moral norms of the "traditional" society alien and incomprehensible to them and facilitated their destruction. The isolation from the "concreteness" of the national life of this country pushed them to develop the economy in a direction not relying on traditions, to impart the character of an "artificial mechanism" to the capitalist enterprise. But all these reasons Sombart considers not the main ones. The main reason that the Jews contributed to the development of all these features, characteristic of the economy of developed capitalism, he sees in their religion.

The very isolation of the Jews, according to Sombart, of course, was associated with the attitude towards them of the peoples around them, but it was not a consequence of this attitude, but the cause. He gives examples of a number of eras when the position of the Jews was very favorable (similar examples were given by us in the previous chapters). But this in no way diminished the isolation of Jewish communities. For example, in Arab Spain, Christians were very strongly influenced by Islam and Islamic culture, and the Jews were especially close-knit and nationalistic. The mood of this environment was reflected by Judas Halevy, who emerged from it, one of the most nationalistic Jewish poets.

Sombart sees a special role in the development of capitalism in usury. He says: "From usury arose the basic spirit of capitalism." Indeed, every concrete element is eliminated in it, all qualitative, economic activity takes on a purely commercial character. This is not a physical or spiritual activity that is meaningful in itself; its meaning has been transferred to its final result - money. The grandiose realization of the spirit of usury is the stock exchange, the heart of the capitalist economy. It already becomes the cause, and the real economy becomes the effect. The high activity of the exchange leads to an increase in production, a fall in stock prices - decline, unemployment. Nowadays, this situation is becoming all-encompassing, the modern world economy is often called the "casino economy", many times more funds have been invested in speculation,

This view of the role of usury can be confirmed by the very special attitude of the Catholic Church towards it. She fought him fiercely, as if anticipating in him the destroyer of the society of which she was the foundation. Moreover, there was a special court in charge of usury, and the convicted priest was deprived of his dignity, and the layman was not allowed to take communion. But a number of rules had to deal with latent forms of growth. For example, the debt had to be repaid exactly one year later, on the same day, so that the product taken would not be given back at a time when it was more valuable; or - the debtor was prohibited from providing any services to the lender (hidden form of interest), etc.

But in the period when capitalism was taking shape in the West, the images of the Jew and the usurer were identified (at least in Shakespeare. Pushkin also reflected this).

The occupation of the Jews by usury, which played such an important role in the nature of the influence they had on the development of capitalism, Sombart also does not consider it possible to attribute mainly to external causes. (The usual explanation is that in the Middle Ages, the Church forbade Christians to lend money at interest, while many other areas of activity were closed to Jews.)

Sombart considers all these reasons of a more external nature not decisive, secondary, while he sees the basis of the special attitude of Jews to economic life in their religion, as it is recorded in the Bible and the Talmud.

Even in the Bible a special place is given to usury. One of Jehovah's promises to his chosen people states:

*For the Lord your God will bless you, as He told you, and you will lend to many nations, but you yourself will not borrow; and you will rule over many nations, but they will not rule over you.*

(Deuteronomy 15, 6)

Throughout antiquity, loans were assumed to be disinterested. But already the Pentateuch refers this requirement only to its own: it is *allowed* to take interest from strangers. However, at the end of the Middle Ages, according to Sombart, the permission of interest on a loan to a Gentile becomes *obligatory* (the so-called 798th Commandment in Shulchan Aruch). Already the book of Nehemiah (5, 4-8) shows the existence of an influential layer of usurers. But, of course, only in the diaspora does this activity acquire real scope. The Talmud devotes exclusively a lot of space to the technique of usury: only the study of the Torah is given more space, says Sombart. Since the time of the Crusades, usury, according to Sombart, has become the main occupation of the Jews.

Usury, as well as violations of generally accepted moral norms for one's own benefit, is one of the common human sins. Usury, says Sombart, was the practice of both the Delphic Temple in Greece and medieval monasteries. Sombart cites numerous testimonies from his contemporaries about the unseemly deeds of Christian merchants. So real success is determined here not by the presence of subjects who are ready to take such actions, but by the opportunity to achieve success. The success that fell to the lot of the Jews, Sombart explains by the fact that for them it was not at all about violating the norms of business morality. From their point of view, this was "reasonable", "business" morality, "real law", subordinating economic activity to the primacy of "business", income. Therefore, among them in this direction, success was not weak, yielding to temptation,

It was, according to Sombart, about the collision of two diametrically opposed systems of moral and legal norms. In Roman or Germanic law, all obligations were considered to

be exclusively personal in nature, and the price was determined based on the personal category of "fair price". In the Talmud, however, the idea of obligation is abstracted from a person, can be transmitted, becomes a "bearer demand". If the concept of a "fair price" exists there, then only in relation to one's own people, as applied to strangers, the concept of a "fair price" is absent, the price is such that one can actually get. As one of the examples illustrating the opposition of these two moral systems, Sombart cites the relationship to property. In Roman law and the law of many medieval peoples, property is understood much more personally, more as a "continuation of man" than it is now. In this regard, its alienation is perceived as something unnatural, and the law usually seeks to complicate it. In the Talmud, the opposite is true. So, if, according to German medieval law, a thing stolen and then bought from a thief should be returned free of charge to the original owner, the Talmud considers it the property of the person who bought it, and the original owner can only buy it back. That is, in the first case, a certain connection is assumed between the owner and the thing, which does not disappear due to the fact that someone else paid some amount for it (we could compare this with our attitude towards a kidnapped child),

Gretz also notes a fundamental difference in the economic morals of Jews and Christian society. In *The History of the Jews*, he writes about Polish Jews:

*The non-Jewish world had to, at its misfortune, become convinced of the superiority of the Talmudic law of Polish Jewry.*

And we must admit that on a global scale, this law really won. "Industrial society", which now practically embraces the world, is based precisely on this Talmudic, as Sombart assures, economic morality.

The link between the strengthening of the new way of life and Jewish influence was felt by wide sections of the population. The whole process was very painful; it met with widespread resistance from the people. A well-known example is the movement led by Savonarola in Florence. However, at the same time, at the end of the fifteenth century, similar movements took over all of Italy. In almost all large cities - Genoa, Padua, Lucca, Bologna, Cremona, Florence - preachers appeared, protesting against the decay of the foundations of the old society that had taken over Italy. They carried crowds of people with them. The demands made by these movements were very uniform. And almost always among them was the demand to prohibit usury for a high percentage (reaching 100%), to issue laws restricting Jewish usurers, or even to expel Jews. Jewish historian S. Roth says that, apparently, there was not a single large city in Italy at that time, in which the case would have done without anti-Jewish protests. Monk Barabbas Intermenzis put forward the idea of a pawnshop based on donations and giving loans at a minimum interest rate (5%) or even free of charge. This type of pawnshop was called Monte de Pieta. Another monk, Bernardino da Feltro, fought especially vigorously for its implementation. He faced fierce resistance from the rich, from some cities he was expelled, in others he won. In particular, in Florence, under his influence, in 1487, a decree was adopted to create such a bank, but, as some contemporaries believed, the Jews, for a bribe of 20,000 guilders, obtained from

Lorenzo Medici the cancellation of the decree and the expulsion of da Feltro. Savonarolla later carried out such a measure, but his success was short-lived. It is interesting to note that the overthrow and execution of Savonarolla were the work of Pope Alexander VI Borgia, who came from the baptized Spanish Jews, his enemies even accused him of being a Marrano, i.e. secretly professed Judaism. (This accusation came from the future Pope Julius II and is quoted in the chronicle of Sigismund Tazio for 1492)

Thus, breaking resistance, two forces entered the world - capitalism and Jewish influence.

## **LITERATURE**

Sombart W. Bourgeois. M., 1994.

Sombart W. Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben. Munchen u. Leipzig 1928. (in recent years, it seems, a Russian translation has appeared).

Neumann M. Geschichte des Wuchers in Deutschland. Halle. 1865.

Graetz H. Geschichte der Juden. Bd. ten.

Roth C. The Jews in the Renaissance. NJ 1959.

## **Chapter 7. Emancipation and the struggle for equality.**

In the XVIII-XIX centuries, there is a sharp change in the position of European Jewry. Namely, a rapidly growing movement is emerging among the Jews for a way out of isolation: for the assimilation of the way of life of the surrounding peoples, their culture. This movement gives a completely new character to the European Jewish communities. At the same time, the struggle for the legal equality of Jews is intensifying, which they are seeking in the 19th century, in the overwhelming part of European countries.

The adoption by Jews of the lifestyle of European peoples among these peoples is often called "emancipation", while in the Jewish environment this trend was called "Haskala", and its supporters - "Maskilim".

This coup is undoubtedly associated with the increase in the economic influence of the Jews. So, already from the 16th, and systematically from the 17th century, Jewish businessmen are mastering a completely new sphere of activity - the colonies of European countries. In Brazil, the Jews soon became the dominant stratum, in particular, they held in their hands the sugar plantations, which were the basis of the country's economy. Similarly, in Jamaica, they occupied a dominant position, and Christian merchants complained that the Jews were driving them out. An article in the Jewish Encyclopedia says: "In the colonies, the Marranos contributed most to the development of trade. Their activities spanned the agrarian region and extended to the entire international region ... Quite often, the Marranos, forgetting about Spanish sovereignty, threw off their mask and openly returned to Jewishness." A report from the Inquisition from South America in 1636 states: "They became the masters of all trade in the kingdom: from brocade to rough canvas, from diamonds to caraway seeds, everything passes through their hands. "In the 17th century, Holland began a war with Portugal for the possession of Brazil. The Dutch rely on the support of local Jews. after they seized Recife, "in Recife there were twice as many Jews as Christians." "The Jews carried on a large trade, owned sugar factories, houses; the largest wealthy man was considered Gasper Diaz Pereira. "But in the end the Portuguese won and this led to persecution of the Jews. Then the center of gravity of the Jewish community shifted to North America, where their influence became even stronger. In this respect, the episode with the founding of the Jewish community in New York (it was then a Dutch colony) In 1635 a ship arrived at the Hudson, who had on board Jewish immigrants from Brazil. Governor Stuyvesant at first did not want to allow them to settle in the colonies, but received an order from the West Indies campaign to give such permission "in view of the large capital invested by them (the Jews) in the campaign." Similarly, the first attempts by Jews to obtain citizenship rights in Massachusetts (Aaron Lopez in 1762) and New York (Isaac Eliezer in 1763) met with resistance. Difficulties arose in connection with the then accepted formula of the oath: "according to the true Christian faith ...". But in the end, the text of the oath was changed so that it became acceptable to Jews.



In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, v. the financial influence of the Jews becomes so significant that it turns out to be an important factor in the then European politics. They financed on a large scale the monarchs of many of the then European states (especially the German ones), thereby giving them the opportunity to be more independent in their politics from the nobility and townspeople, strengthening the tendencies of absolutism. The role of the Jews was especially strong in financing the army: in the supply of weapons, ammunition, food. In the German states, the typical combination was "the prince and the Jew" (Fürst und Jude), and in the hands of the latter were the finances of the state. So, for more than a hundred years, the house of the Oppenheims was the court bankers of the imperial court in Vienna. In Prussia, the "Great Elector" Friedrich-Wilhelm used the services of the financiers Gumpertz, Feit, Ries, Aaron and Bronde Wolfe. His son Frederick I entrusted the financial affairs to Liebman, Frederick the Great to Ephraim.

Naturally, wealthy Jews found themselves more and more connected with the life of the country in which they lived, a lot depended on them, they had connections and influence, there were frequent cases when the nobility complained to them. A number of factors pushed them out of isolation in political and cultural life as well.

Simultaneously with the impulses emanating from the ranks of the order, and in European society, starting from the middle of the XVIII century, a trend arises that sets itself the goal of a radical revision of the position of the Jews. Its center was Germany, where the majority of the Jewish population of Western Europe lived at that time. One after another, books are published, plays are staged, proving the senselessness of prejudices against Jews, the height of their moral principles, and often superiority in this respect over Christians.

The most striking figure of this trend was Lessing. Another 23 years old, an aspiring writer, he created the play "Jews". It tells how a certain traveler rescues a certain baron from robbers. The owner of the suspicious tavern spreads a rumor that the robbers are Jews, and they allegedly even noticed their typical beards. But the same traveler takes a fake beard out of his pocket, exposing himself and his friend as robbers. The Baron offers the traveler half of his fortune and the hand of his daughter. But he says that "the God of his fathers has sufficiently endowed him with means" and that he himself is a Jew. "Oh, if only all Jews were like you!" exclaims the baron. "Oh, if all Christians were like you!" - retorts the traveler. This piece was typical: a similar situation was played up in many versions. The newspapers reported on the noble charity of the Jews. The pinnacle was Lessing's famous play Nathan the Wise. In it, the action takes place at the court of the Turkish Sultan Saladin, where representatives of three religions collide: Judaism, Islam and Christianity. The author's obvious goal is to promote religious tolerance, the desire to show that on any of these paths a person can seek God with equal success. But Christians are the least capable of this - the patriarch of Jerusalem is portrayed as a particularly vicious fanatic. The most profound and humane is the hero of the play, Nathan the Wise, who, for example, despite the fact that the Christians killed his seven sons, endows all Christian pilgrims to the Holy Sepulcher with gifts (which already gives off excessiveness). The culmination is Nathan's story of the famous tale of

the three rings. In one family, traditionally, the ancient ring was passed from father to son. But one day, not wanting to offend any of his three sons, the father ordered two exact copies and left each a ring. Sons still argue about whose ring is true ... At first glance, the meaning of the legend is to call for religious tolerance, and the rings symbolize Judaism, Islam and Christianity. But one can also notice a subtext in it: after all, only one ring is really genuine - the oldest, obviously symbolizing Judaism.

On the Jewish side, an equally influential figure in this trend was Moses Mendelssohn, a close friend and peer of Lessing, whom he portrayed under the guise of Nathan the Wise. As a 4-year-old teenager, he dropped out of the Jewish theological school and went to Berlin. On the advice of his mentor, Rabbi Hirschel Frenkel, Mendelssohn studied German, which was then a rarity among Jews. He establishes contacts with educators such as the president of the Berlin Academy Maupertuis and Lessing, and begins his journalistic activities.

Mendelssohn was the creator and leader of that movement in Jewry, which set itself the goal of entering European culture and the acquisition of equality in European society. The first step is mastering the German language, mastering the German way of life. Mendelssohn promoted the bold idea: that the ancient Jewish tradition does not contradict the ideas of the Enlightenment and can be combined with them. He stood at the head of the "Advanced Jews" society, united by this idea. Ideally, assimilation was seen, when the Jews would not differ from other Germans, would be "Germans who profess the Mosaic Law." Naturally, Mendelssohn was the enemy of all plans to return to Palestine, he warns against funding any such projects, convincing that gold alone cannot provide a return. With remarkable foresight, he wrote: "

Mendelssohn met with warm support in the circles of German educators. Although he did not learn German in childhood, and he himself admitted that it was always difficult for him to read and write, Mendelssohn acted as a critic on German literature in the journals of Lessing and Nicolai. He supported Lessing in his struggle for religious tolerance, for the recognition of the high spiritual merits of Judaism. However, their positions differed in significant shades. For example, Lessing in his Masonic dialogue "Ernst and Falk" warns against the prejudices of patriotism, in "Education of the Human Race" he argues that in the Jews God raised the future educators of mankind. Mendelssohn, on the other hand, is a passionate Jewish patriot, immediately responding to any accusations against Jews (for example, for a brochure on Jewish usury in French Alsace). He wrote that if it was necessary to choose between the equality of Jews and a break with religious tradition, then the Jews, albeit with regret, would have to abandon equality. Lessing, promoting the equality of all religions, publishes anti-Christian articles in his journal. Mendelssohn, on the other hand, always speaks enthusiastically about Judaism, but he sometimes speaks of Christianity very unceremoniously. For example, in response to the rather stupid argument of one pastor that the miracles of Christ are true, for they were attested by contemporaries, he gives the example of an exposed Jewish false miracle worker and a swindler who was then in prison. Of course, the enlightenment adherents applauded him for the fact that he so cleverly "cut the priest." that if one had to choose between the equality of Jews and a

break with religious tradition, then the Jews, albeit with regret, would have to abandon equality. Lessing, promoting the equality of all religions, publishes anti-Christian articles in his journal. Mendelssohn, on the other hand, always speaks enthusiastically about Judaism, but he sometimes speaks of Christianity very unceremoniously. For example, in response to the rather stupid argument of one pastor that the miracles of Christ are true, for they were attested by contemporaries, he gives the example of an exposed Jewish false miracle worker and a swindler who was then in prison. Of course, the enlightenment adherents applauded him for the fact that he so cleverly "cut the priest." that if one had to choose between the equality of Jews and a break with religious tradition, then the Jews, albeit with regret, would have to abandon equality. Lessing, promoting the equality of all religions, publishes anti-Christian articles in his journal. Mendelssohn, on the other hand, always speaks enthusiastically about Judaism, but he sometimes speaks of Christianity very unceremoniously. For example, in response to the rather stupid argument of one pastor that the miracles of Christ are true, for they were attested by contemporaries, he gives the example of an exposed Jewish false miracle worker and a swindler who was then in prison. Of course, the enlightenment adherents applauded him for the fact that he so cleverly "cut the priest." Lessing, promoting the equality of all religions, publishes anti-Christian articles in his journal. Mendelssohn, on the other hand, always speaks enthusiastically about Judaism, but he sometimes speaks of Christianity very unceremoniously. For example, in response to the rather stupid argument of one pastor that the miracles of Christ are true, for they were attested by contemporaries, he gives the example of an exposed Jewish false miracle worker and a swindler who was then in prison. Of course, the enlightenment adherents applauded him for the fact that he so cleverly "cut the priest." Lessing, promoting the equality of all religions, publishes anti-Christian articles in his journal. Mendelssohn, on the other hand, always speaks enthusiastically about Judaism, but he sometimes speaks of Christianity very unceremoniously. For example, in response to the rather stupid argument of one pastor that the miracles of Christ are true, for they were attested by contemporaries, he gives the example of an exposed Jewish false miracle worker and a swindler who was then in prison. Of course, the enlightenment adherents applauded him for the fact that he so cleverly "cut the priest." for attested by his contemporaries, he gives the example of the exposed Jewish false miracle worker and swindler who was then in prison. Of course, the enlightenment adherents applauded him for the fact that he so cleverly "cut the priest." for attested by his contemporaries, he gives the example of the exposed Jewish false miracle worker and swindler who was then in prison. Of course, the enlightenment adherents applauded him for the fact that he so cleverly "cut the priest."

Lessing was only the most prominent representative of this trend. Montesquieu, in *The Spirit of the Laws*, says that the attitude of Christians towards Jews will forever remain a shame for this age. Mirabeau, who visited Prussia on a secret, either government or Masonic assignment, wrote a pamphlet "On Moses Mendelssohn and the Changing Situation of the Jews." A prominent Prussian official, the *Kriegsrat* von Dom, published a work in which he called for the granting of equality to Jews. When Emperor Joseph II removed some restrictions for Jews, the then famous poet Klopstock honored him with an ode in which he set his act as an example to other princes. The academies

announced competitions for essays on the emancipation of the Jews. Works of the opposite direction also appeared, they, in turn, aroused objections from both the German and the Jewish side. Many brochures "For the Jews" and "Against the Jews" were published. All this literature, according to Gretz, "poured like a waterfall."

How is it to be explained that the Jewish question attracted such extraordinary attention just then? Of course, the Jews isolated in the ghetto were in a strange position for the surrounding Europeans, humiliating their human dignity, and this caused a completely natural protest. It could not but play a role that the spirit of the new, bourgeois society and enlightenment penetrating everywhere was breaking the foundations of the old hierarchical way of life, forcing us to look at all people from a single point of view.

But here's what is amazing: at the same time, the overwhelming part of the German peasantry and many of the townspeople were serfs - and this did not cause the "waterfall" about which Gretz writes. But they professed the same religion, spoke the same language, and in many other respects were much closer to the German (and French) enlighteners than the Jews, so that the severity of their life should have been perceived brighter and sharper. Thus, in addition to the indicated general reasons, there were also some others that determined this particular object of sympathy. One of them is obvious: the ever-increasing influence of Jews on the finances and economy of the country and their desire to strengthen this influence, having achieved the same rights with the rest of the population. Their possibilities were really great. In the essay "The Prussian Monarchy" Mirabeau writes:

*The only merchants and manufacturers with large fortunes in the Prussian provinces are Jews. There are millionaires among them.*

And Gretz confirms that the wealth of the Jews in Berlin far exceeded the wealth of the Christian burghers. Therefore, one should not be surprised that Mirabeau, having visited Prussia for a short time, so sensitively perceived the problem of Jewish equality: he was all around in debt to the Jewish usurers. Likewise, Lessing, having written the play "The Jews", soon got a profitable place in the not very clean business of minting coins, which was in the hands of the bankers Ephraim. When he was writing his "Nathan", he was given an advance by the Jewish merchant Moses Wessely from Hamburg. From these individual strokes, you can imagine the situation on a larger scale. "Persons of the liberal professions" - writers, journalists, actors were then very poorly provided, and financial support meant a lot to them. And the sovereign princes were also susceptible to such arguments. For example, at the beginning of the 19th century, a banker from Frankfurt am Main, Amschel Rothschild, paid the Grand Duke Dalbert 400,000 guilders, for which he granted Frankfurt Jews equal rights with the rest of the population.

But you can see another reason that caused all this movement. Every time an ideology appears hostile to the traditional one, seeking to debunk it and base an understanding of life, proceeding not from the historical roots of the people (but, for example, on logic, Reason, as in the Age of Enlightenment) - it is natural for it to look for an ally in that worldview that cannot be, not a single thread is connected with these roots, rather it is

hostile to them. It is found in Judaism and Jewish tradition. Likewise, during the Puritan revolution in England, there is some kind of mysterious gravitation towards Judaism - purely ideological, since the Jews were expelled from England in the 13th century. Cromwell dreamed of a fusion of the Old and New Testaments, the Jewish Chosen People and the Puritan community. The Puritan preacher Nathaniel Homesius proclaimed that he would like to serve Israel like a slave. The members of the extreme current of that time - the Levelers - called themselves Jews. Cromwell's officers invited him to form a Council of State of 70 members, in imitation of the Sanhedrin. A draft was submitted to parliament to move the holiday from Sunday to Saturday, and the Anabaptist MP Garrison and his group demanded the introduction of the Mosaic Law in England.

If in England of the fifteenth century this trend was not associated with real Jewish interests (the attempt of the Jewish banker from Amsterdam Monassia Israel to achieve the resettlement of a large group of Jews to England, Cromwell rejected) - then in Europe of the fifteenth century (and especially in Germany) both incentives acted simultaneously. European "free-thinkers" saw the Jews as allies in their struggle against the "prejudices of the old society," "the darkness of Christianity," "the dominance of priests." The "era of salons" begins in Germany. Wealthy Jewish homes are turning into centers attracting representatives of the aristocracy, writers, philosophers, actors, imbued with ideas of enlightenment. The most influential were the Berlin salons of Henrietta Hertz and Rachel Levina. The salons of Dorothea Faith, Marianne Meir and others enjoyed somewhat less success. It was visited by aristocrats, members of the royal house, even the crown prince, statesmen, diplomats, scientists, writers, philosophers: Schleiermacher, Fouquet, Chamisso, Schlegel, Alexander and Wilhelm Humboldt. In Vienna, this was the salon of Fanny Itzig, the daughter of the banker Itzig and the wife of Nathan Aronstein, promoted to baron. During the Vienna Congress, diplomats from all countries gathered at her place. A laboratory arose in the salons, which developed public opinion: those who were their own person in these salons could count on warm reviews from the press; when he went to another city, he was supplied with letters of recommendation. Reputations and careers were built here. For example, from these salons the glory of the young Heine and Berne went. Already at the end of the "era of salons" Berne wrote: diplomats, scientists, writers, philosophers: Schleiermacher, Fouquet, Chamisso, Schlegel, Alexander and Wilhelm Humboldt. In Vienna, this was the salon of Fanny Itzig, the daughter of the banker Itzig and the wife of Nathan Aronstein, promoted to baron. During the Vienna Congress, diplomats from all countries gathered at her place. A laboratory arose in the salons, which developed public opinion:

those who were their own person in these salons could count on warm reviews from the press; when he went to another city, he was supplied with letters of recommendation. Reputations and careers were built here. For example, from these salons the glory of the young Heine and Berne went. Already at the end of the "era of salons" Berne wrote: In Vienna, this was the salon of Fanny Itzig, the daughter of the banker Itzig and the wife of Nathan Aronstein, promoted to baron. During the Vienna Congress, diplomats from all countries gathered at her place. A laboratory arose in the salons, which developed public opinion: those who were their own person in these salons could count on warm reviews from the press; when he went to another city, he was supplied with letters of recommendation. Reputations and careers were built here. For example, from these salons the glory of the young Heine and Berne went. Already at the end of the "era of salons" Berne wrote: In Vienna, this was the salon of Fanny Itzig, the daughter of the banker Itzig and the wife of Nathan Aronstein, promoted to baron. During the Vienna Congress, diplomats from all countries gathered at her place. A laboratory arose in the salons, which developed public opinion: those who were their own person in these salons could count on warm reviews from the press; when he went to another city, he was supplied with letters of recommendation. Reputations and careers were built here. For example, from these salons the glory of the young Heine and Berne went. Already at the end of the "era of salons" Berne wrote: when he went to another city, he was supplied with letters of recommendation. Reputations and careers were built here. For example, from these salons the glory of the young Heine and Berne went. Already at the end of the "era of salons" Berne wrote: when he went to another city, he was supplied with letters of recommendation. Reputations and careers were built here. For example, from these salons the glory of the young Heine and Berne went. Already at the end of the "era of salons" Berne wrote:

*It is surprising that here really only Jews or baptized Jews keep open houses, and Christians do not. There are few rich Christians, and officials have no money for this.*

The success of this activity was reflected primarily not in the conquest of political rights by the Jews, but in the rapid growth of their influence on the cultural life and ideology of society. German schools and universities began to open their doors to Jews. Jewish (written for a Jewish reader) literature in German also appeared. The influence of Jews in educated German society is characterized, for example, by the fact that in 1788, when playing "The Merchant of Venice", then famous actor Alec began with a monologue, in which he assured the public that the actors did not want to write old prejudices. Fichte wrote in 1793:

*I know that in many learned societies it is considered possible to attack both morality and religion - just not the Jewish nation.*

Indeed, negative statements about Jews have become narrower and unsafe. So in 19803 Wilhelm Gratenauer published a brochure "Against the Jews. A word of warning to all our Christian fellow citizens", in which he spoke out against the granting of equal

rights to Jews. There were, of course, several objections. The State Chancellor writes to the Prime Minister that, in his opinion, Gratenauer's brochure should not have been published. And in September 1803, a decree of King Friedrich Wilhelm III appeared, forbidding the discussion of the Jewish question in print. Thus, Gratenauer is deprived of the opportunity to respond to the attacks to which he was subjected. All his requests to allow him to publish the answer remain unsuccessful. The prime minister writes to the chancellor that, in his opinion, Gratenauer's article was disgusting. In 1804 he was dismissed from the court where he served. With a large family, the Gratenauer is left without any means of subsistence - and at the same time all his creditors are suing him. Finally, he was beaten in the street ...

The business of providing Jews with political equality moved more slowly. In England, in 1753, Parliament passed a law allowing Jews (i.e., persons of the Jewish faith) to naturalize in England and acquire English citizenship. However, this decision provoked such numerous and violent protests that the government, fearing the outcome of the upcoming elections, passed a new bill through parliament, repealing the one that had just been adopted. The French Revolution, with its principles of equality and brotherhood, naturally gave rise to the hopes of the Jews for the acquisition of equality. In the main provinces of France, the number of Jews was not very large - about 10 thousand, but about 40 thousand of them lived in Alsace and Lorraine adjacent to Germany. The request of the Jews to the National Assembly for granting them equal rights met with resistance from the deputies from Alsace and Lorraine, whose orders required them to fight against this measure. The discussions were resumed several times and were very heated. An article in the Jewish Encyclopedia reports on special orders from the cities of Alsace and Lorraine. Thus, the mandate from the citizens of Metz contained complaints about "harm originating from the Jews"; Strasbourg required special rules for Jewish trade; Hagen - laws against Jewish usurers; Nancy, Nomeny, Diez and Mirkur - restrictions on the number of Jews in the area, etc. In 1789, the decision to grant equality was not passed with one vote. In the debate, Abbot Mori said: "The Jews are people and, therefore, our brothers. Let them be patronized, as people in general, The provision of equality was supported by the Jacobin club and the Commune. It was proclaimed by a decree of September 27, 1791, although at the same time a decree was passed on the revision of debts to Jewish usurers. The same position was preserved in the constitution of the era of the consulate and at the beginning of the Empire. During the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, emancipation extended to other territories conquered by France or under its influence. So, it covered the whole of Germany - the law on the emancipation of Jews in Prussia, in particular, was adopted in 1812. The idea of providing Jews with complete equality was supported by the influential Chancellor Hardenberg. The provision of equality was supported by the Jacobin club and the Commune. It was proclaimed by a decree of September 27, 1791, although at the same time a decree was passed on the revision of debts to Jewish usurers. The same position was preserved in the constitution of the era of the consulate and at the beginning of the Empire. During the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, emancipation extended to other territories conquered by France or under its influence. So, it covered the whole of Germany - the law on the emancipation of Jews in Prussia, in particular, was adopted in 1812. The idea of

providing Jews with complete equality was supported by the influential Chancellor Hardenberg. The same position was preserved in the constitution of the era of the consulate and at the beginning of the Empire. During the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, emancipation extended to other territories conquered by France or under its influence. So, it covered the whole of Germany - the law on the emancipation of Jews in Prussia, in particular, was adopted in 1812. The idea of providing Jews with complete equality was supported by the influential Chancellor Hardenberg. The same position was preserved in the constitution of the era of the consulate and at the beginning of the Empire. During the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, emancipation extended to other territories conquered by France or under its influence. So, it covered the whole of Germany - the law on the emancipation of Jews in Prussia, in particular, was adopted in 1812. The idea of providing Jews with complete equality was supported by the influential Chancellor Hardenberg.

Such rapid changes, as always, have taken on the reaction - both ideological and political. For example, Fichte wrote in 1793:

*Almost all the countries of Europe are covered by a powerful, hostile state, which is at war with all other states, and in some of them it monstrosly oppresses its citizens ... This state is based on hatred of the entire human race.*

Such an ideological reaction to emancipation is parallel to the position of a practical and pragmatic figure - Napoleon. In 1806, he called a meeting of the Council of State to discuss the situation of the Jews in France. The reason was the complaint that in Alsace, Jewish usurers and speculators were the owners of almost all land and livestock (even Gutzwiller admits that "some Jewish usurers may have been more tough"). Napoleon said:

*The French government cannot be indifferent to the fact that a nation capable of any baseness began to reign supreme over the two beautiful departments of Alsace ... Whole villages have been turned into their own property by Jews, they have replaced feudal lords ... They risk one day being killed by the indignant population of Alsace, as has happened so often, and almost always through their fault.*

*It is dangerous to leave the keys to France: Alsace and Strasbourg in the hands of a nation of spies, not in the least tied to this country.*

*It is a nation within a nation ... Jews are not in the same category as Protestants and Catholics. They should be subject to political law, not civil law, since they are not citizens.*

As a result, the rights of Jews in France were limited by the law of May 30, 1806. Jews who did not live in the Upper and Lower Rhine department could not settle in them. In other departments, they could only settle if they acquired land and were engaged in agriculture. They were deprived of the right to nominate deputies for recruiting. Article 18 said: "This decree is valid for 10 years, since we hope that after this period there will be no difference between Jews and other citizens. If our hope deceives us, then the



decree will be extended for as long as how many we find necessary. " The defeat of Napoleon led to the fact that the rights granted to Jews in other countries were taken back almost everywhere. But this was an attempt to fight the general trend of History. With every revolution (1830, 1848) ) the rights of the Jews increased - and this was due to the fact that the Jews vigorously supported the revolution. In England, equality was granted in 1825, then in Portugal, in Belgium in 1830, in Canada - in 1832, 1861 - to Württemberg, 1862 - to Baden, 1868 - Saxony and with the formation of the German Empire in 1870 - throughout it). In Denmark, Jews were given equality in 1849, Norway - 1851, Sweden and Switzerland - 1865, Spain - 1858, Austria-Hungary - 1867, Italy - 1870, Bulgaria - 1878, Turkey - 1908, Russia - in February 1917. In Canada - 1832, In Germany, the revolutionary Frankfurt Parliament adopted a law on emancipation in 1848 (it was extended in the same year to Kassau and Hanover, in 1861 to Württemberg, 1862 to Baden, 1868 to Saxony and with the formation in 1870 The German Empire - for the whole of it). In Denmark, Jews were given equality in 1849, Norway - 1851, Sweden and Switzerland - 1865, Spain - 1858, Austria-Hungary - 1867, Italy - 1870, Bulgaria - 1878, Turkey - 1908, Russia - in February 1917. In Canada - 1832, In Germany, the revolutionary Frankfurt Parliament adopted a law on emancipation in 1848 (it was extended in the same year to Kassau and Hanover, in 1861 to Württemberg, 1862 to Baden, 1868 to Saxony and with the formation in 1870 The German Empire - for the whole of it). In Denmark, Jews were given equality in 1849, Norway - 1851, Sweden and Switzerland - 1865, Spain - 1858, Austria-Hungary - 1867, Italy - 1870, Bulgaria - 1878, Turkey - 1908, Russia - in February 1917.

Jewish emancipation is a striking historical phenomenon. In a historically very short period of time (1st century), a large layer of European Jewry abandoned its way of life, as if specially created to fence it off from other peoples, and adopted the way of life of the surrounding European population. One gets the impression that history has compressed the spring of alienation around Jewry in order to let it unfold all the more. It was a turning point in the history of Jewish relations with other nations. Could such a sudden upheaval be fully explained by the growing economic power and closer economic ties that we pointed out at the beginning of this paragraph? Unlikely! The rich, and especially the richest Jews, did not really need emancipation. For example, the founder of the Rothschild banking house, Amschel Rothschild, was received at the court in Vienna, while emphasizing their loyalty to all orthodox rituals - and this aroused some curiosity, but also respect. It was rather poor Jews like Mendelssohn who benefited from emancipation.

A very careful researcher of the spiritual life of Jewry, Gershom Sholem, initiated the study of another, religious and spiritual, aspect of this movement. He is associated with one religious movement of that time: the so-called *Sabbatianism*... In 1665, a Jew from Asia Minor, Sabbatai Zvi, declared himself the Messiah and was quite successful, causing a significant movement, not only in the Ottoman Empire, but also in Europe. Many Jews in Amsterdam and Hamburg sold their property to travel East and join the new Messiah. There were various expectations around 1666. But there was a trend that, based on the book of the Zohar, predicted the emergence of the Messiah in 1648 - the time of the success of Sabbatai Zvi. It was a time of general religious quests

in Germany, the 30-year war had just ended, a revolution was beginning in England, a split was brewing in Russia. The mystical currents of different countries and peoples influenced each other. The secretary of the Londonskrgr of the Royal Society of Oldenburg wrote to Spinoza: "Here everyone is talking about the possibility of Jews returning to their homeland (... that all Jews must become Marranos (Marranos are Spanish Jews who outwardly converted to Christianity, but secretly continued to follow the Jewish Law). Everyone must descend into the abyss of Evil in order to overcome it from within. The follower of this doctrine was a Jew from Thessaloniki, Jacob Frank, who moved to the part of Poland that belonged to the Austrian Empire, the founder of the "Franco" sect. (Jews from Thessaloniki were called Franks in Turkey, so his name actually means "Jacob of the Franks." He taught that now the old Torah is canceled, sin can be holy, the Mishna's statement that God must be honored with "bad passions" takes on a new meaning. Everyone must take on the sin of Marrano, heart and mouth should not say the same thing. Frank taught: just as the forefather Jacob deceived his father by putting on animal skins, so we must put on the clothes of a Christian in order to be more successful in our deception.

What the Sabbatian teachings are called "the abyss of Evil and Uncleaness" is fully consistent with the concept of orthodox Jewry about the world around it and the peoples inhabiting it. Then "immersion into the Abyss" appears to be a mystical analogue of emancipation, its spiritual foresight. Or vice versa, emancipation is the practical realization of mystical vision.

A similar thought is expressed by Gershom Scholem. Ot believes that Sabbatianism played a large role in the preparation of the reform of Judaism and its introduction to the ideas of enlightenment in the 19th century. Scholem writes:

*Now (the end of the 18th and 19th centuries) the desire for revolution should not have looked for a way out in the practice of "holy sin," but could find a way out in the restructuring of life.*

Frank himself is known only as a prophet or ideologist. Having converted to Catholicism, he continued to preach his doctrine, had followers who secretly followed his doctrine, but also belonged to Orthodox Judaism. His teaching was a mixture of Jewish mysticism with nihilism: predictions and calls for destruction, descent into the abyss so that it was no longer possible to descend below. He taught that the paths up and down converge, the sacred and the sinful do not differ (in particular, this was expressed in the violation of sexual norms). Although Frank himself periodically attended Mass, his teachings surfaced and he was sentenced to imprisonment in a fortress in Czesochowa. From there he was liberated by the war, and after the next partition of Poland, he moved to the town of Ofenbach in Austria. He died in 1788 and even before his death he said: "I came to free the world from all laws and commandments.

Already a generation of Frank's younger followers took part in the emancipation movement. This, the researchers say, is a great difficulty in investigating the entire stream. Precisely wanting to be real "enlightened" (in the then accepted sense of the

word) Europeans, they not only tried to hide their Francoist origins in every possible way, but even destroyed a number of Francoist documents, ashamed of their mystical radicalism.

Scholem reconstructed in detail the biography of one such Francoist, Moses Dobrushka. He was born in 1753 to parents associated with the Francoist environment (or even directly belonging to a sect). He, in any case, was a relative of Frank. In 1775 he was baptized with several brothers and sisters (perhaps influenced by Francoist ideas). At the same time, he took the name of Franz Thomas Schönfeld (and his wife Elka - Wilhelmina). Baptism, apparently, did not break his close ties with the Francoists. He played a prominent role in supplies to the Austrian army, which speaks of his significant condition. His father was also worthy, together with Frank, Popper and Henigsberger, who had a monopoly on the entire tobacco trade in Austria. In the period after baptism, Schoenfeld-Dobrushka was active in the then widespread Masonic order of the "Asian Brothers". Apparently, thanks to him, access was opened for Jews to this order (while earlier Shegeman Freemasonry was closed to Jews). In those days, participation in Masonic lodges was a very significant stage in entering the "enlightened" European environment. Another active figure in the same order was Hirschfeld. On the other hand, under their influence, the order adopted such Judaist elements of symbolism as a six-pointed star and a seven-branched candlestick.

Here comes some remaining mysterious episode. Frank dies in 1788. In the circles of his supporters, a rumor is spreading that Dobrushka will be his heir. It is not clear whether this position was offered to him, but he refused, or whether he sought it and did not receive it. In any case, his fate changes radically - he leaves for France and again takes on a new name - Junius Frey. There he gives himself up to revolutionary ideas (but also to speculation). He keeps the house on a grand scale, his sister marries Danton's closest associate, Chabot. But when Danton's circle was defeated, Dobrushka died with them. He was guillotined in 1794. For the avoidance of misunderstanding, it should be noted that he was the only Jew known to have played an active role in the French Revolution. But a symbolic thin thread can be traced:

## **LITERATURE**

Roth C. The Jews in the Renaissance. N.-J. 1959.

Sombart W. Cit. in Ch. 6.

Graetz H. Geschichte der Juden. Bd. II.

Berne L. Briefe. 1927.

Bartels A. Lessing und die Juden. Leipzig. 1922.

Bartels A. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Bd. II. Leipzig. 1905.

Fichte Johann Gottlib. Beitrag zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publikums über Französische Revolution. Leipzig. 1922.

Perry Thomas W. Public Opinion, Propaganda and Politics in Eighteenth-Century England. Cambridge, Mass. 1966.

Scholem Gerschom. Die judische Mystik in ihrer Hauptstromungen. Zurich. 1957.

Scholem Gerschom. Du Frankisme au Jacobinisme. Paris. 1981.

Mandel Arthur. Le Messie Militant. Milano. 1989.

"Jewish Encyclopedia". T. II. Articles "America" and "Anti-Semitism"., T. X article "Freemasonry", T. XIII article "Sabbatai Tsevi and the Sabbatian movement", "Prussia".

## Chapter 8. The Golden Age of Assimilation.

*(From Napoleonic Wars to World War I)*

The 19th century (more precisely, the period indicated in the title of this chapter) is a period of mass entry of Western European Jewry (and by the end of the century - Eastern European) into European culture. This is the era of the assimilation of the European way of life by the overwhelming majority of Jewry, basically, the still unclouded entry of the Jews and their ever-growing influence in almost all spheres of activity of European society. It seemed that the isolation of Jewry in European society was coming to an end. Although the harbingers of the difficulties inherent in this process appeared at the same time.

There are, however, several areas in which Jewish influence is becoming particularly noticeable and effective. It is especially important that new ones - art (especially literature) and the press - are joining the traditional sphere of application of Jewish forces - finance. Thanks to this, the Jewish influence ceases to be external, the center of gravity is transferred to ideology, the point of application of this influence becomes not so much the material as the spiritual life of European peoples.

The large quantitative participation of Jews in Western European art can be judged by the famous, well-known names. Such, for example, as composers Meyerbeer, Mendelssohn, Mahler. Offenbach thundered in a lighter and more intelligible style throughout Europe (and the libretto of his operettas was written by Halévy). The great actresses Sarah Bernhardt and Rachelle enjoyed world fame. But perhaps the strongest was the influence of the Jews in literature and the most striking episode - their participation in the course of German literature, which took shape in the 1920s and received the name "Young Germany". The historian of German literature Bartels says of him:

*Young Germany is essentially a Berlin-Jewish product that originated in Rachel Levin's salon.*

The most famous figures of this trend were Heinrich Heine and Ludwig Berne (Loeb Baruch).

In Heine, the contradictions that European Jewish writers had to face were especially vividly manifested. On the one hand, he was forced to create and achieve success in German national art, like a German poet writing in German. His bright talent could only manifest itself in this form. And his talent is undoubted - it was not for nothing that Lermontov and Tyutchev translated him. But on the other hand, he was a product of the Jewish spiritual world, and Jewish traditions not only prevented him from becoming an exponent of the German attitude, but repelled him. Lacking direct feelings that reveal the beauty of German nature, language and culture, he was forced to perceive them through others. So, he wrote to his friend Moser: "I can only convey the perception of beauty by other people." Thanks to this, his poems were deprived of immediacy, were

often imitative. Even the famous "Lorelei" - in terms of plot, images, rhythm - is almost an exact copy of Brentano's poem. The same reasons led to the fact that in Heine's poems such a place is occupied by ridicule, turning into abuse, often poorly clean - an element completely alien to poetry. His poems "Attatrol", "Germany. Winter's Tale" and others are just rhymed feuilletons. He was the first to introduce this feuilleton style into poetry. Attatrol ", " Germany. Winter's Tale "and others are just rhymed feuilletons. He was the first to introduce this feuilleton style into poetry. Attatrol ", " Germany. Winter's Tale "and others are just rhymed feuilletons. He was the first to introduce this feuilleton style into poetry.

Heine had very strong Jewish national feelings, and at the same time he could realize his bright talent only as a German national poet. This gave rise to duality and conflict in his soul. All this was superimposed on a passionate and irritable temperament and was the source of the feeling of hatred, which more and more subjugated the poet.

Two objects of hatred tormented Heine all his life: the Germans and Christianity. He practiced inventing more offensive nicknames for the Germans, which would pester like a spit: like "people-lackey" or "people-poodle" (Bedientenvolk, Pudelvolk). He wrote, for example:

*The Göttingen inhabitants are divided into students, professors, philistines and cattle. All of them are not much different from each other.*

This is just another way of saying that the Germans are brutes. Essentially, what's so witty about that? One of his last works, the poem "Germany. A Winter's Tale" ends with the goddess of the city of Hamburg inviting him to discover the future of Germany, but instead of a coffee cup she divines on a chamber pot. Unable to withstand this "smell of the German future", Heine flees. More than once he expresses the idea that all his misfortunes were due to the fact that Germany's struggle for liberation from Napoleon is crowned with success. Waterloo is generally a world-historical catastrophe: "it would be much better if they beat us." In a letter to his friend Sethe, he says:

*Everything German is disgusting to me, and you, unfortunately, are German. Everything German affects me like an emetic. German is disgusting to my ears. My poems are disgusting to me because they are written in German. Even writing this letter is hard for me, because writing German letters painfully affects my nerves.*

Heine was baptized (as he says, "to get an entrance ticket to European culture"), and this made his position even more ambiguous. He wrote to his friend Moser: "I assure you, if the law had not prosecuted the theft of silver spoons, I would not have been baptized." In his diary, he wrote down verses: "And you crawled to the cross that you despised / which a few weeks ago you hoped to trample into the mud." His very first tragedy "Almanzor" was, in his own words, unsuccessful, since it was too imbued with hatred of Christians. The first attempt to stage it ended in scandal. In a letter to Moser, he says: "Christians and Jews are persecuting me at the same time. The latter is

because I do not defend their equality in Baden, Nassau and other holes. Oh, myopic! Only at the gates of Rome can Carthage be defended."

*There are varieties of insect ideas that stink for a long time when crushed. This is Christianity. This spiritual bug was crushed 1800 years ago (crucifixion of Christ ?!), and still poisons us, poor Jews, the air.*

National Jewish feelings broke through so often throughout his life that undoubtedly some contemptuous attacks against Jewishness (necessarily balanced by the same attacks against Christianity, such as: "Rabbi and Capuchin stink the same") were not sincere. He wrote, for example:

*Oh Moses, Rabbi Moishe, the great fighter against slavery, give me nails and a hammer so that I can nail the ears of our cozy slaves in black-red-gold livery to the Brandenburg Gate.*

Or he assured that if there was only one Jew left in the world, then everyone should be honored for the happiness of traveling 100 hours just to shake his hand.

He writes to a friend:

*Love for a strict and consistent rabbinic spirit has lurked in me for many years.*

Shortly before his death, Heine said: I have returned to Jehovah.

The Concise Jewish Encyclopedia describes Heine as follows: "His works are least of all the embodiment of the German national character or spirit." It is difficult to argue against this, but we are faced with a riddle so often encountered later that now it does not seem mysterious: how, by what methods and forces did you manage to pass black as white? To convince the Germans, and indeed all mankind, that Heine, the enemy of everything that (right or wrong) was dear to the German national consciousness, in his own words hated everything German, was the greatest, and even a *German* poet?

Berne is now almost forgotten, but then his name was pronounced on a par with the name Heine (and both were mortal enemies, annoyed each other, pulling out unsightly details of the rival's personal life for public viewing). With only slightly different shades, Berne was tormented by the same problems as Heine. Wolfgang Menzel, one of the representatives of Young Germany, wrote about him:

*For him, everything is justified that is effective as an element that decomposes Germany. He does not tell us what he wants to establish when he destroys everything. He thinks the French will take care of it. It is only necessary to break down this wall, make the Germans hate everything German, despicable, funny, everything French desirable, and help in every way possible so that the French become masters of Germany, first by fraternization, then by invasion.*

Indeed, Berne, for example, hated Goethe all his life. He wrote: "Since I can remember myself, I hate Goethe." He quotes one letter he allegedly received:

*This Goethe is a cancerous tumor on the German body, and worst of all, everyone considers illness to be a higher health.*

Berne comments:

*How fair it all is! (...) Goethe is the king of his people: having overthrown him, it is easy to cope with the people.*

On the other hand, he shares his thoughts:

*Bad Jews are no worse than bad Christians (...). They even have the advantage of being smarter than them (...). They have blood or not, but they don't have the watery sap of snails. In short, they are not philistines. Oh woe to the philistines ...*

In one letter, Berne recounts a youthful experience that seems to have had a profound effect on his life. During the occupation of Germany by the French, he had to go somewhere from his native Frankfurt and for this to receive a passport. A French officer glanced at him and wrote "a Jew from Frankfurt."

*My blood stopped (...). Then I swore in my heart. Wait! Someday I will prescribe a passport for you, and for you and everyone else! And isn't it, isn't it, I have fulfilled my oath?*

Elsewhere he writes:

*Forgive nothing, forgive nothing, no reconciliation that sets the border of hatred! All our thoughts are with the remains of our fathers. Only in the future will we live, only for the future - to die.*

The assessment which Gretz gives in his History of the Jews to the activities of Heine and Berne is instructive. He compares them to kings throwing handfuls of gold coins - these are their ideas.

*They created an elegant language for the Germans, a clear-wisdom perfected language and opened a temple of freedom for them.*

And this is after Goethe, Schiller and the romantics! But he characterizes the *direction* of their activity even more peculiarly :

*True, both of them outwardly broke with Judaism (were they baptized?), But only as fighters who seized the weapons and the banner of the enemy in order to defeat and destroy him more accurately.*



Who was this enemy: the German people? or Christianity?

The era of "Young Germany" spawned some of the most famous names among European Jewish writers of the 19th century. But the Jewish influence in literature itself in the following decades not only did not weaken, but expanded and deepened. Bartels, whose "History of German Literature" we have already quoted, attributes to Jewish influence the creation of a "literary industry" concerned only with financial success and the size of circulation, speculating on the low taste of a wide circle of "upper and middle rabble":

*This industry, there can be no doubt, was brought to us by modern Jewry, which subjugated the German theater and, to a large extent, also the press and created a powerful party in literature, with which it is simply impossible to fight.*

Jewish influence in the press emerged in the same era and later exerted (and still) a strong influence on life. After World War II, Paul Bang, an economic adviser to the German Conservative Party, wrote about this (under the pseudonym Meister). This influence is clearly visible already in the era of the Napoleonic wars, when a whole group of Jewish journalists and publishers appeared in defeated Germany. A typical example is the newspaper "Telegraph", which was published in 1805 by Lange (Davidson), once a close friend of Lessing. Later he published "German Herald" and "New Telegraph". These newspapers ridiculed German generals and statesmen, even the royal court, including the queen. These newspapers were distinguished by such a consistent pro-French orientation that Telegraf

Another group of German-Jewish journalists, led by Saul Asher and Eduard Itzig, were famous for the struggle they waged against the German romantic writers: Arnim, Brentano, Kleist. They were branded as reactionaries, obscurantists, persons unreliable from the point of view of the French authorities. There was even a rumor that Kleist was mentally ill. With what irritation Gretz speaks, describing many years later that era, about these ... (the term, probably, corresponding to the "Russopians" as applied to the Russians) - Arnim, Brentano, Fouquet! It can be seen how outraged he is that they sympathize with the German Middle Ages, Christianity, the Church.

This is how one of the most influential German newspapers "Frankfurter Zeitung" (Frankfurt Newspaper) came into being. In the 50s. banker Rosenthal began publishing Business Review in Frankfurt. Soon, another banker, Leopold (Loeb) Sonnemann, turned it into the "Frankfurt Business Gazette". From 1866 it became known as the "Frankfurt newspaper". The equally influential Berlin newspaper Berliner Tageblatt was founded in 1871 by Ruben Moses. The organ of the Democratic Party "Berliner Zeitung" was founded in 1877 by Ulstein, a Jewish businessman who made a fortune in trade and later created the Ulstein-press concern, which owned dozens of newspapers - political, advertising, and entertainment.

So far, we have talked mainly about Germany. But the founder of Reuters, which we all associate with Britain, was born in Germany, had the surname Jehoshaphat and was

baptized as an adult. One of the most influential newspapers in England, the Daily Telegraph, was bought in 1855 by Joseph Moses Levy. Further, his son owned the newspaper under the name Lawson, and then as Baron Burnham - until 1928, the Daily Express was published by R.D. Blumenfeld. In Italy, until 1912, the editor of the main organ of the socialist party "Avanti" was the Jew Treves (as a result of a fierce internal party struggle in 1912-1914, this place was captured by Mussolini, but in 1914 Treves survived him again). In the United States, the press was even more under Jewish influence than in Europe. For example, one of the leading newspaper bosses, the creator of the "yellow press" there was Pulitzer, a Hungarian Jew who came to America without knowing a word of English. (Now one of the most prestigious literary awards is named after him). Adolph Ochs owned the New York Times from 1896, the Philadelphia Times from 1901.

The whole world was influenced by such ideologues as Marx and Freud. Many Jews became known in science, for example, the physicist Hertz, who experimentally proved the existence of electromagnetic waves, a number of mathematicians - Jacobi, Cantor, Kronecker, etc.

Parallel to the ideological, the economic influence of Jewry grew continuously. Zombart gives the following figures for Germany. In the 1870s, during the era of large publicity campaigns, of the 25 largest campaigns, 16 were Jewish. In some campaigns, 1/3 to 1/4 of the founders were Jews. In 1911, among the directors of the largest campaigns, Jews accounted for 1/8, among members of the supervisory boards - 1/3. In the population of the country, they were less than 1%. According to the income data (calculated on the basis of the taxes collected), the income of the Jews was about 3-4 times higher than that of the Christians.

Not surprisingly, in an area where Jewish influence was particularly strong - finance - it grew even stronger. For example, the central German bank - Reichsbank - was a private enterprise under the supervision of the Ministry of Finance. It was founded in 1873 by 15 persons, of whom 11 were Jews, namely: Berend, Meyer, Bleichroeder, Gelpke, Mendelssohn, Oppaneheim, Plaut, Rothschild, Stern, Warshaver and Zwicher.

Of course, all these processes were associated with a sharp increase in the number of Jews in the educated strata of society. The same Zombart reports that, for example, of Christians for every 10,000 people, 61 students attend the upper classes of the gymnasium, and 385 of Jews (in Prussia). He's writing:

*These figures correspond to their real participation in our spiritual and cultural life. Needless to say, our art, literary, musical market, our theater - if not yet completely in their hands, then is under their significant, one might safely say, decisive influence.*

The enormous weight of the Jews in culture, the press, and the economy, of course, was reflected in their general position and their influence on other aspects of life. A sign of this was, for example, the solemn celebration in 1905 of the 250th anniversary of the

settlement of Jews in the United States. President Theodore Roosevelt addressed the celebration committee with a letter in which he said:

*I believe that it is safe to say that very few nations in our country, and perhaps no other, have directly or indirectly had such a strong influence on the formation of the American way of life.*

Weizmann recalls that before World War I, there were four Jews in the Italian cabinet of ministers: Luzatti (prime minister), Ottolungi, Sonnino and Titani. In addition, the Jew was the mayor of Rome.

Another, not outwardly solemn, but usually hidden aspect of this influence can be found, for example, in the memoirs of a major German diplomat of the era before World War I, von Eckardstet. He tells how, being the German ambassador to England, he became close to the head of the Rothschild house - Baron Alfred Rothschild. The latter was very hostile against the "Muscovites" because of the "barbaric treatment of the Jews by the Russian authorities."

*If it was a question of interfering with the secret intrigues of Russian diplomacy, then Alfred Rothschild, with his great influence, was always at his service.*

In particular, according to the author, Japan was very hesitant before entering the war with Russia due to its financial weakness. The British government preferred to remain neutral and did not favor large loans to Japan. Then Eckardstet brought the Japanese ambassador to London, Count Hayashi, with Rothschild. The latter assured the count of his sympathy for the cause of Japan and that the Japanese government could count on the support of the Rothschild house. According to the author, this played a decisive role in Japan's decision to start a war.

The influence of Jews on US politics can be imagined from the episode that we mentioned in passing in Ch. I. In 1910, a violent campaign was launched in the US press against the Russian government, which restricted the entry of Jewish American citizens into Russia. (Although at the same time the press wrote about the plight of Jews in Russia, and it was not clear why Jews should strive there.) In retaliation, they demanded the termination of the Russian-American trade agreement. At the beginning of 1911, President Taft was visited by a delegation of influential Jews led by the prominent financier Jacob Schiff, the director of the bank Kuhn, Loeb and So. The President told the delegation that according to the data of the American Ambassador to Russia, the Russian government restricts the entry of Jews, since for the most part it is about Jews who have recently emigrated from Russia, who now want to return as American citizens so as not to be restricted by the Pale of Settlement. According to the president, each country has the right to formulate its own immigration policy. An outraged Schiff refused to shake Taft's hand in parting. As he left he exclaimed: "So this is war." It took 10 months to win this war. At the end of 1911, both houses of Congress proposed to the President that the Russian-American treaty be terminated, and he complied. The following year, an organization of Jewish Freemasonry (or Masonic-style)

in the United States - the B'nai Brit Order - awarded President Taft a medal "as the man who did the most for the good of the Jews in the past year." Yet in the next election (1913), Taft was not re-elected. According to the president, each country has the right to formulate its own immigration policy. An outraged Schiff refused to shake Taft's hand in parting. As he left he exclaimed: "So this is war." It took 10 months to win this war. At the end of 1911, both houses of Congress proposed to the President that the Russian-American treaty be terminated, and he complied. The following year, an organization of Jewish Freemasonry (or Masonic-style) in the United States - the B'nai Brit Order - awarded President Taft a medal "as the man who did the most for the good of the Jews in the past year." Yet in the next election (1913), Taft was not re-elected. According to the president, each country has the right to formulate its own immigration policy. An outraged Schiff refused to shake Taft's hand in parting. As he left he exclaimed: "So this is war." It took 10 months to win this war. At the end of 1911, both houses of Congress proposed to the President that the Russian-American treaty be terminated, and he complied. The following year, an organization of Jewish Freemasonry (or Masonic-style) in the United States - the B'nai Brit Order - awarded President Taft a medal "as the man who did the most for the good of the Jews in the past year." Yet in the next election (1913), Taft was not re-elected.

The situation in England is characterized by a long dispute over the problem of electing Jews to Parliament. It lasted from 1829 to 1858 and was associated with the fact that the Jews refused to take an oath containing the words "in the true Christian faith." As a result, the text of the oath was changed to be acceptable to Judaists, and Baron Rothschild took a seat in Parliament.

And directly among the leaders of the policy of most European states, the role of the Jews was significant. Thus, in Germany, a number of leaders of the liberal movement, which began with the revolution in 1848, were Jews. For example, Gabriel Risser participated in the "Pre-Parliament" and the Constituent Assembly, and later in the Erfurt Parliament. Ludwig Bamberger was one of the founders of the Liberal Party, later he and Eduard Lasker created the Progressive Party. Heinrich Friedberg was the ministers of the Kaiser for many years, Rudolf Friedenthal was one of the founders of the Free Conservative Party of Prussia.

D, Israeli, baptized by his father in his youth, had a tremendous influence on the political life of England. He was more than once Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. For a long time he was at the head of the Conservative Party and the Young England movement. At the end of his life, the queen elevated him to the rank of Lord Beaconsfield. Luzatti was the prime minister of Italy. In France, Cremier was many times a minister, at the same time a major national Jewish figure - the creator of the General Jewish Union. As Minister of the Interior, Cremieux granted French citizenship to Jews living in Algeria, while Algerian Arabs did not. This became a significant factor in the alienation of Algeria from France, which in the XX century. led to a bloody war and the separation of Algeria.

Major European countries supported the granting of equality to Jews in other states. Thus, at the Berlin Congress of 1878, France and Germany made the acceptance of "freedom of religion" a condition for the recognition of the independence of Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania. On behalf of England D.Israeli demanded that this principle be extended to all parts of the Ottoman Empire "requiring assistance from the great powers." It is clear from the context that it was about the rights of the Jews. Objection, Prince Gorchakov said: "In Serbia, Romania, as well as in Russia, the Jews are dangerous - they are not like the Parisian, London, Berlin and Viennese Jews and their equalization in rights will cause harmful consequences for the country." The demand from France and Germany was accepted by Congress.

How did the relationship develop between the Jews and the peoples among whom they lived in this century, when all the paths in life were open to them? Many expressed the hope that the "Jewish question" had ceased to exist, that the assimilation of the Jews was carried out or would be fully realized in the near future.

Indeed, the number of mixed marriages increased. So, the number of Jewish mixed marriages in Prussia was in 1880 - 10%, in 1890 - 13%, in 1913 - 20% of the number of purely Jewish. In a book on the future of the Jews, Sombart reports that in 1905-1906 they accounted for 22% of purely Jewish marriages. The so-called "reformation" movement appeared in Judaism, which defined belonging to Jewry as an attitude towards religion, not a nation. They proclaimed that Jews are citizens of the "Mosaic denomination" of a particular country. At the Frankfurt congress of rabbis of this direction, it was decided that a Jew has the right to marry a Christian woman who recognizes monotheism. Many Jews converted to Christianity. For example, in Vienna in 1868 there were 2 cases of baptism of Jews, in 1875 - 65, 1880 - 113, 1885 - 255, 1904 - 617.

But there were also signs that the situation was not so idyllic. Thus, the famous German historian Treitschke, in his History of Germany in the 19th Century, devoted a whole section to Jewish influence after the liberation of Germany from Napoleon. He speaks of "the early Jewish talents that dominated the daily press":

*They proudly demonstrated their Jewish separateness and at the same time claimed to be the leaders of German public opinion. The destructive and embittered action of radical Jewry was all the more dangerous because the Germans had for a long time been mistaken about the spirit of this new literary force. They unconditionally took for the German enlightenment what was in fact Jewish hatred of Christianity and Jewish cosmopolitanism.*

Apparently, after the revolutionary upheavals of 1848, which affected almost all of Europe, for the first time they began to talk about *Jewish dominance in the press*. Thus, V. Ebeling in his book "0 Literature and History" writes about the Vienna press:

*Jewish dominance was striking. Of the 80 writers I met, 57 were "ours." But such was political life throughout Europe in 1848.*

In Germany, a broad movement was formed under the slogan of fighting "Jewish dominance" in the press and finance. Treitschke wrote:

*The current agitation has correctly captured the mood of the society, which considers Jews to be our national misfortune.*

It was this movement that called itself "anti-Semitic"; apparently, then this term first appeared. The movement was influential, it was actively supported even by the court preacher Stecker. The "Anti-Semitic League" was created, collecting 250,000 signatures for a petition to the Reichstag demanding certain restrictions on Jews. The Reichstag, however, did not accept this requirement. One of the ideologists of that time, V. Marr wrote a brochure "The Victory of Jewry over Germanism", where he argued that the world had already been conquered by Jewry, and the vanquished were even forbidden to talk about it. The only country still undefeated and struggling is Russia, but the balance of forces is such, he says, that the outcome of the struggle is a foregone conclusion. All forces will be thrown against Russia and they will make an Archimedean fulcrum of it in order to turn the world around.

In England until the beginning of the XX century. anti-Jewish popular unrest arose. For example, in 1911 they took over all of Wells, where many Jewish businesses and shops were destroyed.

In France in 1881-1882. the magazines Anti-Jew and Anti-Semit were published. Proudhon said about the revolution of 1848: "We changed the Jews." In connection with the "Dreyfus Affair" a wave of violent anti-Jewish sentiment erupted in France. General Staff Officer Dreyfus was convicted in 1894 on charges of transferring military secrets to Germany. Later, protests began and accusations that the case was fabricated. Public opinion is split. On the one hand, accusations of anti-patriotism and a desire to humiliate the army were heard, on the other, of militarism, reactionaryism and anti-Semitism. The question of Dreyfus's guilt or innocence turned into a question of party struggle. In the end, the "Dreyfusars" won, Dreyfus was first pardoned, then rehabilitated, awarded an order and received the rank of major. As a result, a whole layer of the political elite has changed. This coup cannot be viewed in isolation from the preceding "case" that also shook France - "Panama". The stock campaign for the construction of the Panama Canal sold off shares for huge, unsecured sums and sought government support for bribes. When the scandal erupted, it turned out that bribes were taken by ministers, parliament members, and most of the press. One of the initiators of the exposure was journalist Drumont, publisher of the Svobodnoye Slovo newspaper, in which he also led a violent anti-Jewish campaign, and author of the book Jewish France. And it turned out that the main leaders of the scam were: Baron Reinach (originally from Hamburg)) and Emil Arton (Aaron), whose assistant was Isaac Blank. It revealed, that for 8 years the campaign pulled out more than 1,300 million rubles from the pockets of the inhabitants. francs, 1/2 mln. people were ruined. The main culprits

escaped punishment (Baron Reinach mysteriously died suddenly), but a whole layer of compromised politicians seemed to be forced to leave politics. As a result of the victory in the "Dreyfus Affair," most of them returned - the most famous of them is Clemenceau.

But even from the Jewish side, views were sometimes expressed, breathing the spirit of the Talmud, crossing out all the achievements of the "century of assimilation." As an example, apparently from among the most extreme, we will cite an article by the Zionist Kloetzel, published shortly before World War I in the Janus magazine. It says:

*Anti-Semitism, hatred of Jews, on the Jewish side is opposed by a great hatred of everything non-Jewish: just as we Jews know about every non-Jew that he is somewhere in the corner of his soul an anti-Semite and should be one, so every Jew in the deepest basis of his being hates everything non-Jewish.*

*This great "Jewish hatred" once found a truly brilliant reflection in literature: Shakespeare's Shylock. Through everything that is exaggerated, corresponding to the nature of the comedy, we see the main thing: before us is a Jew and, moreover, a hating Jew.*

*Of course, perhaps there never was a Jew who craved a piece of meat from Antonio's breast. Surely, no Jew is now obsessed with Nero's thoughts: "everything would be non-Jewish in one neck - but we would have a knife in our hands." Surely, many attempts of "rapprochement", "assimilation" were taken as seriously from our side as tragic Jewish thoughts - from the other side. But despite all this, the word "Jew" does not sound safe for any non-Jew, as well as for every Jew the word "goy", which is not an insult, but an undeniable sign of division. Let's be honest: non-Jewishness, no matter how highly we value an individual non-Jew, no matter how much we are friends with him, is non-Jewishness, as an impersonal mass, as a spirit, as a sphere of activity, cultural unity, each of us puts - who can argue here? - below Jewry! I think it can be argued that there is a movement in Jewry that is a mirror image of anti-Semitism. This is what I call "the great Jewish hatred."*

*I am not authorized to speak on behalf of Jewry; Perhaps I have not yet spoken a word on these topics with any Jew; but this silence is often of a legal nature: in fact, nothing in me is so alive as this confidence that if there is something that unites the Jews of the whole world, then this is this great, sublime hatred.*

*I think I should avoid giving scientific reasons, for example, historical or psychological. I feel this hatred, this hatred against something impersonal, unattainable - as a part of my nature, ripened in me, for the development and growth of which I must consider some law of nature to be responsible. For it seems to me to be the core of a human being - to realize your nature and stand for it.*

*We are considered a danger to Germany. Of course, this is so, it is as certain as the fact that the German spirit is a danger to the Jewish. But can we be required to commit suicide? No one can doubt the truth that strong Jewry is dangerous to anything non-Jewish. All attempts by certain Jewish circles to prove otherwise are as cowardly as they are comical! But it looks even stranger when non-Jews*

*turn to us quite seriously with a demand to abandon our natural hatred and expect restraint, modesty and humility from us.*

This is, of course, an isolated opinion. But it is interesting as an extreme manifestation of disappointment in the path of assimilation. Much more broadly, the same mentality manifested itself in the movement of Zionism - the desire to create its own Jewish state. Although the idea of returning to Palestine has always existed in Judaism, Theodore (Benjamin Zev) Herzl created a new, worldwide movement. He himself belonged just to the type of assimilated Jew, he was a Viennese journalist. But during the debate over the "Dreyfus Affair" he was the Parisian correspondent of the Austrian newspaper "Neue Freye Presse" and what he saw revolutionized his worldview. In his program book "The Jewish State", he proves that Jews never manage to become an organic part of European society and the only healthy way out for them is to create their own state and live like other peoples. He's writing:

*No one will deny the plight of the Jews. In all countries where they live in significant numbers, they are persecuted to a greater or lesser extent. The peoples among whom we live, all together and each individually, are overt or covert anti-Semites. After brief periods of tolerance, the enmity against us wakes up again every time. On the one hand, there is our proletarianization and conversion into revolutionaries, we supply non-commissioned officers of all the parties of the coup, and on the other hand, from above, our colossal monetary power is growing. Let us be given sovereignty over a certain area of the earth's surface, sufficient to satisfy the just needs of our people, we will take care of the rest.*

He considered Palestine a suitable place for such a state, but he considered Argentina or Uganda as a possible option. The movement received widespread support and became worldwide. The 1st International Zionist Congress met in 1897 in Basel, the 2nd - in the same place in 1898. Before World War I, 11 such congresses had already taken place. In 1897, the World Zionist Organization was created. However, from the very beginning, different formulations of the goals of the movement were outlined. Thus, the influential ideologue of Zionism Ahad-Haam (Ginsberg) wrote:

*Have we suffered so much (...) only to eventually found a tiny state? (...) It is necessary to create a spiritual center in Zion, which would unite the scattered people in spiritual bonds. For this, it is enough if an insignificant part of the Jewish people, at least only one percent of it, moves to Palestine ...*

*one percent.*

*... the Jewish masses are condemned to remain in the scattering, and only a select few must create a cultural center in Palestine, from which the light of the new - Jewish creativity will emanate.*



Indeed, the real side of the Zionist program remained very uncertain. If it was about helping Jews in the most difficult situation, emigration, for example, to the United States gave a much more realistic way out. If it was about gathering a large part of the Jewish people in Palestine in the spirit of "fulfilling the promises", then it was a religious program associated with the appearance of the Messiah. Yes, and it is difficult to imagine (and still) how it could be implemented. Palestine certainly could not saturate such a number of people - it can be seen now. True, some Zionist documents of that time spoke of Palestine and adjacent countries (for example, Asian Turkey). In any case, it is not clear how they could have lived Jewish settlers, guided by the principles of Judaism. For example, for a long time the colonies in Palestine existed on the donations of Baron Rothschild - the head of the famous banking house. But what would he himself do in a state based on the principles of Judaism? For example, in view of the commandment

*Give your brother neither silver, nor bread, nor anything else that can be given for growth.*

(Deuteronomy 23.19.)

But no matter what political goals the leaders were guided by, for tens and hundreds of thousands of ordinary Jews, participation in this movement meant recognition that, from their point of view, the entire grandiose course of emancipation and assimilation, despite its brilliant successes, failed. The current of Zionism, created by Herzl, caused a huge surge of feelings and thoughts in the Jewish environment, but in the period under consideration it had a very weak practical response - by the beginning of World War I, immigrants to Palestine numbered only a few tens of thousands. But in the 19th century. East European Jewry was captured by an incomparably more powerful movement - emigration to more capitalistically developed countries: Germany, England, but above all - to North America. 80% of emigrants went to America, most of them from Russia. In this one century, the Jewish population of North America has grown from 3,000 to 2 million. Thus, a huge force began to be created, which subsequently played (and still plays) a decisive role in the world.

The Jews who moved to America mainly came from the areas where they lived within the framework of the kahal organization. It is unlikely that this organization was completely preserved during the resettlement overseas. But, on the other hand, it is difficult to imagine that the tradition, forged by centuries of existence in this system, would completely disappear. Indeed, a number of Jewish organizations emerged in America - for example, in 1906 the American Jewish Committee was created, headed by Jacob Schiff, owner of one of the largest American banks, Kuhn, Loeb and Co. A large number of Jewish immigrants were united in organizations called "orders". What these organizations were is not entirely clear. They were built from "lodges" and "chapters", which resembles a Masonic organization. But sometimes it is argued that the resemblance was purely superficial - it is possible that some other tradition manifested itself here. The Jewish Encyclopedia provides the following information about these orders:

The order	Year of foundation	Membership for 1907	Number of boxes
Brit Abraham (independent)	1887	104796	446
Brit Abraham	1859	55957	331
B'nai Brit	1843	21500	420
Sons of Benjamin	1877	20336	150
Sons of Yehuda	1890	19000	118
Agavat Israel	1893	16963	132
Free sons of Israel	1849	10920	105

Subsequently, the B'nai B'rith Order enjoyed the greatest influence. It was founded on October 13, 1843 in New York by several Jewish immigrants from Germany. At first it was called Bundes Bruder, that is, the Union of Brotherhood, the German name reflected the origin of the founders. The later name B'nai B'rith means the Covenant Union. A later book on the history of the order states: "As Jews born in the United States became too Americanized and insufficiently Jewish, the Jewish community was unable to integrate them. This ultimately led to the creation of B'nai B'rit Because the American Jewish community was unable to meet the challenge, the German Jewish community created the necessary structures to

## LITERATURE

Graetz H. Geschichte der Juden, Bd. II.

Bartels A. Cit. in Ch. 6.

Heinrich Heine. Werke. Dresden. 1906.

Heines letzte Gedichte und Gedanken, herausgegeben von Strodtmann. 1869.

Berne L. Berliner Briefe. 1927.

Berne L. Briefwechsel mit Henriette Herz. 1905.

Steig R. Heinrich von Kleists Berliner Kampfe, Berlin, 1901.

Meister A. Die Presse als Machtmittel Judas. Vunchen 1930.

Treitschke. Deutsche Geschichte im 19.Jahrhundert. 3 Theil, Leipzig, 1889.

Ebeling W. Zur Geschichte und Literatur. Berlin. 1867.

Sombart W. Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben. Cit. In Ch. 6.

Sombart W. Die Zukunft der Juden. Leipzig, 1912.

Kurschner Joseph. Semi-Kurschner, Berlin, 1901.

Blokosky S. The distorted Image, N.-J., 1975.

Cheskel Zwi Klotzel. "Das grosse Hassen". Journal "Janus". 1914, no. 2.

Lebenserinnerungen und Denkwürdigkeiten von Herrn Freiherrn  
v. Eckardstein. Bd. II. Leipzig, 1921.

Frank W. Nationalismus und Demokratie in Frankreich der dritten Republik. Hamburg  
1933.

Herzl. T. Jewish State. SPb. 1896.

"Jewish Encyclopedia". Vol. III, articles "Anti-Semitism", "Assimilation", "Ahad-Haam  
(Ginsberg)". T. XIV, "Zionism"

"Brief Jewish Encyclopedia" T.I, Article "Assimilation".

Dash Moore Deborah. B'nai B'rith and the challenge of ethnic leadership. NJ1981.

## **Chapter 9. Role in the development of the socialist movement.**

The antagonism of capitalism and socialism is so emphasized and demonstrative that it involuntarily inspires doubt: does it not mask internal unity? Are these not two paths leading to the same goal: the creation of an "industrial society" or "technological civilization"? At least from the point of view of the question that interests us, both of these phenomena are very similar: if, according to Sombart, the Jews played a significant role in creating the capitalist version of modern industrial society, then their role in creating the ideology of socialism and organizing the socialist movement is striking to everyone.

In the field of ideology, capitalism and socialism appeared for the first time precisely not in the form of antagonists. On the contrary, the first socialist doctrine that emerged in the 19th century can be assessed as a radical version of the ideology of capitalism. And at the same time, Jews played a very significant role in its development. It's about Saint-Simonism.

In Saint-Simonism, the ideology of the emerging society of developed capitalism and socialist ideology have not yet separated, have not yet begun to appear as two opposite tendencies, so that in it it is often difficult to distinguish between them. The basis is the feeling that a new, completely extraordinary era has come: the "Industrial Age". The problem of organization comes to the fore. The organizers of society, especially its economy, must become the true leaders of the state, life must be subordinated to them. The "vague and metaphysical" idea of freedom is opposed to the development of civilization and the planned organization of society. Society is a real machine, it must be built rationally, on the basis of a scientific plan. All life must be redesigned to serve one purpose: increasing the efficiency of the economy. For this it is necessary to create a suitable religion, "just as in the Normal School they teach to build bridges or roads." It is necessary to achieve the same perfection in the management of the psychology of the masses, with which mathematics solves geometric problems. And property must be given the form that will be more conducive to the development of a centralized, state-run economy (this is actually the only element of Saint-Simon's teachings, which makes him a "predecessor of scientific socialism"). Later, the students of Saint-Simon extended this idea to the family. And property must be given the form that will be more conducive to the development of a centralized, state-run economy (this is actually the only element of Saint-Simon's teachings, which makes him a "predecessor of scientific socialism"). Later, the students of Saint-Simon extended this idea to the family.

Saint-Simonism was the first movement in Europe in which political messianism, the dream of the coming of a "new age", was combined with strong Jewish influence. Saint-Simon himself identified the future victory of his teaching with the Jewish "Kingdom of

the Messiah", the upheaval that the Old Testament predicted and which the Jews awaited.

Among the followers of Saint-Simon, Jews played a prominent role. He enjoyed financial support from several Jewish financiers. Among his closest collaborators were Jews: the financier Olind Rodriguez and his younger brother Eugene, Emil and Isaac Pereira, d'Eichtal, the poet Leon Halévy, Moise Renaudet, Félicien David. There was even an anecdote about a businessman on the Paris stock exchange, who, on advice for the success of his business to acquire a Jewish partner (an interesting touch to characterize the then financial circles!) Answered: but I have two Saint-Simonists! Even the accusation that socialism is a Jewish conspiracy to destroy Christian society, which arose so often later in right-wing circles, was apparently first expressed in connection with Saint-Simonism (in the work "The Godless Comedy" by the Polish poet Krasiński).

After Saint-Simon's death, Jewish influence among his followers grew even stronger. Saint-Simonists (not even Jews) attended the Paris synagogue. Rodriguez wrote that his meeting with Saint-Simon made possible the synthesis of Judaism and Christianity. At the funeral of Saint-Simon, he said: in the future, Moses will be the creator of the cult, Jesus Christ - dogma, and Saint Simon - religion, the pope. In their messianic quests, the Saint-Simonists came to the conviction that a Messiah should be born, whose mother should be Jewish. They published a proclamation, "To Jewish Women," which said, "Your race is the political and economic bond of humanity." In search of the mother of the new Messiah, some of them even went to the Middle East. True, they did not find the Messiah, but they developed a plan for the construction of the Suez Canal, which was later carried out.

It is striking that in Saint - Simonism one can find the sources of both the ideology of financial capitalism and socialism. Some of his students became the leaders of the revolutionary movement in France, and some - the founders of banks, railways (and not only in France). But they all originated from among the professional scientists and engineers that had developed in Paris around the École Polytechnique and the Normal School. Then Bazar, Buchet, Cercle became the leaders of secret societies, professional revolutionaries. Anfantin became the organizer of the construction of the Paris-Lyon railway, the Pereira brothers - railway construction in Austria, Switzerland, Spain and Russia, Talbot - in Italy. Moreover, other Saint-Simonists were also involved as engineers. They also founded a number of the largest French banks. In general, the founders of socialism in the 19th century. they did a lot for the capitalist development of Europe, to give it the character of "financial capitalism". For example, in Germany a prominent role in this direction was played by G. Mevissen and A. Oppenheim, who were under the influence of Saint-Simon.

On the other hand, in the writings of Saint-Simon such concepts as the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, the class struggle, and the organization of labor appear for the first time.

But, of course, the socialist movement acquired its true scope in Germany. At its origins is the mysterious figure of Moses (or Moritz) Hess. This self-taught self-taught person,

who came out of the Orthodox Jewish environment, outwardly gives the impression of a failure: he not only did not create his own group or party, but did not even find at least some significant number of followers. And nevertheless, his influence on the first steps of the socialist movement in Germany is enormous, he owns a number of concepts that later formed the basis of the prevailing socialist ideology, although those who were inspired by his ideas (first of all, Marx and Engels) tried to present him as semi is a comic figure who does not deserve serious consideration.

Hess's idea is that the future of Europe will be determined by the alliance of Germany as the bearer of Hegelian philosophy, France - revolutionary socialism and England - the new political economy (cf. "three sources of Marxism"). Already in the 30s of the XIX century, he expressed the idea that all life is determined by industrial development, which leads to the progressive impoverishment of the working people and to a social catastrophe. He developed the idea of alienation of labor in the form of money, he is the author of a criticism of human rights as the rights of the bourgeois. Criticizing Weitling, he argued that socialism cannot be realized only as a protest against material deprivation, that it must be based on the logic of thought and science. Finally, he owns the view that the realization of Feuerbach's atheism in life is communism. It was he who opened the world of these new communist concepts to Bakunin. Marx came to these views a few years later and in view of his close acquaintance with Hess - it is incredible, not without his influence. Bakunin wrote (letter to Guillaume from S. 1869):

*Moritz Hess, as educated as Marx, but more practical (?) And in a sense, who created the latter.*

About Engels Hess wrote:

*He left me as a super-zealous communist. This is how I wreak havoc.*  
(Letter to Auerbach dated 19.VI.1843).

But what is *mysterious* about Hesse is that at the same time he was a convinced Zionist, an indefatigable promoter of Jewish national ideas. And it is amazing that this was not the result of a crisis, a change of views: no, it happened exactly at the same time , and throughout his entire life.

In his first work, The Sacred History of the Human Race, Hess wrote:

*This people (Jews) was originally called to conquer the world - not like pagan Rome, by the power of their muscles, but through the inner sublimity of their spirit. He himself wandered as a spirit through the world he had conquered, and his enemies could not destroy him, for the spirit is elusive. This spirit has already permeated the world, there is already a longing for a way of life worthy of the ancient Mother. It will appear, this new order, the old Law will again appear in an enlightened form.*

He considers Jewry as the engine of modern Western progress, Russia as its main enemy. Jewishness, he says, is a nation, not a religion. Hess predicts that even after the creation of a Jewish nation-state, most of the Jews in the West will remain in their places, and mainly Jews from the "eastern barbarian countries" will move there. In a later book, *Rome and Jerusalem*, Hess says:

*First of all, the race struggle, the class struggle is secondary.*

He wrote:

*Anyone who denies Jewish nationalism is not only an apostate, a traitor in the religious sense, but also a traitor to his people and his family. If it turns out that the emancipation of the Jews is not compatible with Jewish nationalism, then the Jew must sacrifice emancipation.  
Every Jew must be, first of all, a Jewish patriot.*

And at the same time, he participated in the work of the First International, advocated international workers' solidarity and class struggle, and even criticized the Erfurt Program of German Social Democracy for having a national flavor in it.

Finally, in his article "On the Essence of Money," Hess expresses an even more complex idea:

*The Jews, who in the natural history of the world were supposed to fulfill the function of transforming man into a wild animal, performed this as a professional job.*

The form in which the socialist movement in Germany played its world-historical role, it acquired in the hands of two figures: Marx (whose real name was not even Karl, but Mordecai) and Lassalle. Both of them were strongly influenced by the English economist of Jewish origin Ricardo - not a socialist, but who created the "labor theory of value" that was fundamental to a number of socialist movements. Marx and Lassalle were at enmity, and in their correspondence Marx liked to call Lassalle "liquid", while Lassalle, apparently referring to Marx, used to say that Jews should be kept away from social democracy. But in his youth, Lassalle was an ardent Jewish nationalist, he dreamed of standing at the head of his people and leading them to liberation by "shedding Christian blood," and such feelings are not easily overcome.

And here is how Bakunin characterized Marx and his entourage (in the manuscript "My Relations with Marx"):

*He is a Jew himself, he has around him, both in London and in France, but especially in Germany, a whole bunch of Jews, more or less intelligent, intriguing, mobile and speculators, like all Jews, everywhere, trade or banking agents, fiction writers, politicians, newspaper correspondents of all trends and shades, in one word literary brokers and, at the same time, stock brokers, standing with one*

*foot in the banking world, the other in the socialist movement and sitting on the German daily press - they took over all the newspapers - and you can imagine how vile literature comes out of it all. So, this whole Jewish world, which forms an exploitative sect, a bloodsucker people, a skinny gluttonous parasite, closely and amicably organized not only across all state borders,*

Of course, this is a response from the enemy and a person who is extremely biased. Unexpectedly, more objective information about Marx's national feelings can be gleaned from the memoirs of Prince Clovis Hohenloe. He recounts a conversation with the famous French journalist Maxime Du Cam:

*By the way, we started talking about the Jews and he said that he got acquainted with Marx and the latter allegedly expressed to him the idea that the International and its party do not recognize individual nationalities, but only humanity. Du Cam replied that although patriotism is a secondary thing, however, elevated to a principle, it contributed a lot to the accomplishment of important matters. Marx objected passionately to this: "How do you want us to be patriots, when since the time of Titus we have no fatherland!" Du Cam gave the impression that this was the reason for the emergence of the International, which owed its origin to the Jews.*

One way or another, Marx and Lassalle left their inheritance almost exclusively to the Jews. We meet another mysterious figure: Paul (Pinkhus) Singer, a Jewish millionaire (Singer sewing machines were in most families in our country for a long time after the revolution) - at the same time as the patron of social democracy opened party congresses and represented the party in Reichstag - and in addition was the head of the Jewish religious community.

The first socialist German workers' association "Workers' Brotherhood" was organized in 1848 by Buttermilch (taking the name Stefan Born). Later, Lassalle organized the "German Workers' Union", of which Singer became chairman after his death. The first social democratic newspaper in German was started by the Jew Karl Hochber. The central organ of Social Democracy was Forverts, which was in turn led by Bernstein, K. Liebknecht (his father, the famous revolutionary V. Liebknecht, was German, and his mother was the daughter of Paradiza, a stock speculator from Poland) and Kurt Eisner. During World War I, a split occurred in the German Social Democracy, after which the Austrian Jew Stampfer became the editor, then Kuttner replaced him. The same was the case with other organs of the German Social Democracy. Thus, Kautsky edited "

In the field of theory, the situation was similar. When Bernstein revised Marxism, Kautsky objected to it. The role of Jews in the leadership of German Social Democracy is discussed in the book by W. Sombart "Proletarian Socialism". He gives such names from among the leading ones: Singer, Ostadthagen, Schönbank, Arons, Parvus (Gelfand), R. Luxemburg, Kautsky, Haase, K. Liebknecht, Bronstein, Brown, Frank, Wurm, K. Zetkin, Hilferding, Levy, Kon ... A similar picture is drawn by Robert Michaels



in the book "Sociology of Parties", calling about the same names. He adds that the local organizations were almost exclusively headed by Jews.

In the book cited above, Sombart writes:

*The head of the social democracy in Austria was and is, apparently, only Jews.*

Michels gives the names of the Jews who were in the leadership of the Austrian Social Democracy: Victor Adler, Ellenbogen, Austerlitz, Fritz Adler, Otto Bauer, Max Adler, Hertz, Teresa Schlesangner and many others. A prominent figure in the international social democratic movement Hendrik de Man, in his memoirs, says about the situation of the Social Democratic Party of Austria-Hungary:

*With all the respect that was given to the outstanding abilities and qualities of the "father of the party" Viktor Adler, he was reproached for the tendency to fill positions close to him, preferably by Jews.*

*Victor Adler's case was not unique; in an even more absolute form, the same took place in connection with his son Friedrich, who between 1933 and 1940, as secretary of the Second International, was finally surrounded by exclusively Jewish functionaries. Even worse consequences had, in my opinion, the unsuccessful policy of recruiting Leon Blum for the French Socialist Party he led, and has continued to this day.*

According to Sombart, among the leading figures of the period of the Paris Commune, Jews were: Leon Frankel, Simon Mayer, Dacosta, Isidore de François, Gaston Cremier.

In America, the founder of the Socialist Party in 1877 was Daniel de Leon. In 1905, when the American Federation of Labor split into right-wing and left-wing factions, Samuel Gompers headed the first, and Foster the second.

In England, the leadership of the Fabian Socialist Society also included Leonard Wolfe and Harold Lasky.

Michels writes that the organizing congress of the French "Party Ouvrier" in 1879 was possible only thanks to the financial assistance of Cremier. The publication of "L'Humanite" in 1904 was carried out thanks to the financial contribution of Jewish bankers. Among the most influential Jewish leaders of the French Socialist Party, he singles out Millerand (but he seems to come from a mixed marriage) and Leon Blum, whom we have already met.

According to the same author, the situation in other countries was not significantly different. In the USA, among the leaders of the Socialist Party, Jews were Hilquist, Simons, Waterman; in Holland - Henri Polyak, Vainkup, Mendelsso; in Italy - Luzatti, Treves, Modigliani, Lambroso. Michels says:

*In many countries, for example, Russia, Romania, and especially Poland and Hungary, the leadership of the parties was almost without exception in the hands of the Jews, which was evident at first glance at international congresses.*

The author assures that the same was the case among the anarchists. It is important to note that Michels is a socialist, who even lost his chair for his socialist actions. In his statements about Jews, he is very cautious and gentle. For example, he congratulates the German Social Democracy on the fact that it was able to defeat the danger of anti-Semitism, the main representative of which was Dühring (when Anti-Dühring appeared). However, he cannot refrain from observing:

*The general trait of adaptability and spiritual mobility of Jewry cannot explain the intensity of the quantitative and qualitative influence of Jews in the labor movement.*

And it turned out that in the twentieth century, the century of revolutionary upheavals, the leadership of the revolutionary parties consisted, mostly of Jews.

First of all, the question arises: maybe the Jews who participated in the socialist movement were internationalists and atheists who broke with their national roots and their influence on this movement did not in any way reflect their Jewish origin? At least in many cases, it can be established that this was not the case: even in this work, we met examples of leading figures of the socialist movement, who at the same time were clearly national-minded Jews. The clearest example is Moses Hess. We know less in this respect about Marx and Lassalle, but there is direct evidence of some national elements in their worldview. Cremieux first created the "Israel World Union", and then helped organize the French workers' party. Bernstein was one of the leaders of the German Social Democracy, and towards the end of his life he moved to Palestine. One of the founders of the Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party and editor of its organ "Russian Worker", Khaim Zhitlovsky, was at the same time the author of the brochure "Jew to Jews", in which he called on Jews to return to their people. Kautsky, in his polemic with Trotsky in his book "From Democracy to State Slavery", as one of the most terrible dangers arising from the Red Terror, frightened by "pogroms against Jews and Bolsheviks" (Jews in the first place!).

There are many such examples, but they only *justify the* formulation of the main question: what was the *nature of the* Jewish influence on the development of the socialist movement? - but they do not help in any way to *answer* it. It is striking that the Jews, little connected by tradition and origin with the surrounding life, more easily became preachers of its destruction. She did not inspire them with love, they did not feel sorry for her, and they more easily came to the conviction that she was worthless for anything but complete destruction. This was often mixed with memories of previous grievances and humiliations, and sometimes with outright hatred, appealing to inequality that had not yet been overcome. Thus, the Jews radicalized and revolutionized the socialist movement.

Many observers also noted a deeper connection between Jewish religious beliefs and the ideology of socialism. Belief in a grandiose historical and cosmic upheaval that will destroy the old, unjust world, belief in a deliverer - the Messiah, who is called to return to the "chosen people" his primacy in the world and establish a new, perfect order in which all questions tormenting humanity will be resolved - all this very close to the spirit of the doctrine of the coming world revolution, the victory of the proletariat and a new system in which the contradictions of human society and even the contradictions between man and nature will be resolved. And we see that, for example, the followers of Saint-Simon really carried out a certain synthesis of Jewish messianism and socialism. In a number of interesting works, the Russian philosopher and theologian S. Bulgakov traces the central role of the ideology of Jewish messianism in Marxism. He writes, for example:

*In this sense, modern socialism represents the revival of messianic teachings, and Karl Marx, together with Lasalle, are the essence of the latest cut of apocalypticism, proclaiming the messianic kingdom.*

Bulgakov finds analogies between the literature of the so-called "Jewish apocalyptic" and "scientific socialism". They both proceed from some general picture of the historical process. Usually, apocalyptic works describe events that have already occurred, but this is attributed to some ancient author (Adam, Enoch, Baruch ...) and is presented as a prophecy. But in part they also contain a prediction of the future in the usual sense. This literature is based, according to Bulgakov, on a very abstract concept, according to which history is determined and its laws are accessible to human understanding. Although this is expressed using an unusual language for us: symbols of mythological animals, eras, mysticism of numbers. But this path makes it possible to foresee the future, which is drawn in the form of a grand catastrophe, the death of Israel's enemies, the beating of the greats of this world, etc. But it will end with the accession of the Messiah in Jerusalem and an era of universal material prosperity. Bulgakov compares the picture of the struggle of historical forces symbolized by apocalyptic beasts and the deterministic change of epochs with the ideology of the "laws of history" and historical progress, and the impending catastrophe with the socialist revolution. The kingdom of the Messiah corresponds to the advance of a socialist or communist system. Indeed, such predictions as: and the coming catastrophe - with the socialist revolution. The kingdom of the Messiah corresponds to the advance of a socialist or communist system. Indeed, such predictions as: and the coming catastrophe - with the socialist revolution. The kingdom of the Messiah corresponds to the advance of a socialist or communist system. Indeed, such predictions as:

*And the earth will give its fruit 10,000 times, and on one vine there will be 1,000 branches, and on each branch there will be 1,000 clusters, and each brush will bear 1,000 berries, and each berry will give the bark of wine*

breathes the same spirit as Trotsky's prediction (in the article "Literature and Revolution") that in the future communist society "the average human level will rise to the level of Aristotle, Goethe and Marx."

These observations find confirmation from an unexpected side. A. Landauer, who was one of the leaders of the uprising in Munich in 1919, had preached exactly this concept before that: that the socialist revolution would embody the idea of the Jewish faith in the Messiah.

But there are also obvious objections to being too straightforward to hold such views. After all, not only the Jewish followers of Saint-Simon, but he himself felt and proclaimed the connection of his teaching with Jewish messianism. And Saint-Simon was not only not a Jew, but came from an ancient aristocratic family. As in the case of "highly developed capitalism," Jews played a huge role in the creation of the socialist movement, but alongside them were very influential non-Jews like Engels and Plekhanov.

## **LITERATURE**

Talmon JL Political Messianism, The Romantic Phase. London, 1960.

Hayek FA The Counter-Revolution of Science. Glenkoe, Illinois, 1952.

Hss Mses. Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften. Berlin, 1961.

Hess. M. Judische Schriften. Hrsg. T. Zlotisti. Berlin. 1905.

Cornu August. Moses Hess et la gauche hegelienne. Paris. 1934.

Lassalle F. "Diaries". Petrograd, 1919.

Sombart W. Der Proletarische Sozialismus. Jena, 1924.

Michels Robert. Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens. 1925.

Man Hendrick de. Gegen den Strom. Stuttgart. 1953.

Premantle Anne. This little bapd of prophets. New-York. 1960.

"Russia and the Jews". Berlin, 1923 (republished: Paris, 1978).

Steklov Y. "Mikhail Alexandrovich Bakunin". M.-L., 1927, vol. III.

Saint-Simon. Collected Works. SPb., 1912.

Bulgakov S. "Apocalyptic and Socialism". Sat. "Two Grads". M., 1911.

Zinoviev G. "History of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)". L-grd. 1924.

"Jewish Encyclopedia". T. XIII, article "Socialism".

"Concise Jewish Encyclopedia", V.2, article "Zhitlovsky".

## **Chapter 10. In Russia before the revolution.**

### **1. Finance and printing.**

By the time of the 1917 revolution, about 6 million Jews lived in Russia, that is, at that time, the largest Jewish group within one state and at the same time about half of the Jewish people. This circumstance has played and still plays a huge role in the history of Russia.

The bulk of Jews in Russia lived in the 19th century. in the so-called "Pale of Settlement", that is, in the regions that became part of Russia as a result of the "partition of Poland", where they had lived for several centuries. To these lands, 15 more provinces of Russia were added (according to the present divisions, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Russia), as Shulgin says: lands "larger in size than any European state." Outside the "Pale of Settlement", only a few Jews (more precisely, persons of the Jewish faith) had the right to live: with higher education, merchants of the 1st guild, etc. Sometimes these rights were expanded (including, for example, those who worked for them), sometimes they were restored to their original volume.

The bulk of the Jewish population of Russia was organized into religious communities (kagals), which were under the strict leadership of the wealthy elite and rabbis. Their type of life, in general, corresponded to the way of life of the medieval Jewish communities. He was described by Brafman (a baptized Jew) in the Book of Kagal. For a long time this book was considered in the liberal camp - "anti-Semitic slander". But its provisions are very close to those described, for example, by Shahak, speaking of the "totalitarian way" of Jewish medieval communities (and most of the Jews of Russia until the 19th century lived in the medieval tradition). So, most likely, the facts reported in the book are true. We have described this type of life as it emerges from Brafman's book and Shahak's sayings in Chapter 4.

The policy of the Russian government in relation to the Jews of Russia was in the 19th century. inconsistent, opposite principles were replaced in it. Either the government tried to rely on the kagals and their administration (in the spirit of "supporting the folk tradition"), then it tried to instill in the Jews the lifestyle of the rest of the country (in the spirit of "enlightenment").

As in other countries, in the XIX century. and the beginning of the XX century. the influence of Jews on the life of Russia was carried out primarily through their role in the economy, mainly in finance.

It seems to me that AP Subbotin's book "Within the Jewish Pale" can give an objective idea of the economic situation of Jews in the "Pale of Settlement". On the one hand, it is written from a liberal standpoint, and aims, as the author says, to refute the assertion that Jews exploit the rest of the population and live richer than it. On the other hand, it contains many specific facts. So, the author reports: in the Minsk province. among the merchants of the I and II guilds, Jews accounted for 90% in 1876, 98% in 1880, 83% in

1884, and 88% in 1886 (the book was published in 1988). Among all merchants - 87.8%. Among the owners of drinking establishments - 95%. Out of 1297 tobacco shops do not belong to Jews - 4. They occupy 91% of the turnover of merchant trade.

In the Vilnius province, Jews make up 15% of the population. Among merchants - 81%. In 25 years, the number of Jewish merchants increased by 13%, and non-Jewish - decreased by 46%.

In the Kovno province, the share of Jews in the population is 20%, among merchants of the I and II guilds - 81.3%. Among the owners of drinking establishments - 75%. Their share in the large turnover of all merchant trade is 95.5%.

In Volyn province, Jews make up approximately 1/7 of the population. Among the merchants there are 91% of them, their share in the trade turnover is 74%. The share in the tobacco trade is 94%.

In Kiev, Jews make up 10% of the population. Among the merchants of the I and II guilds - 43%, their share in the total trade turnover - 45%. Of the 259 wholesale wine warehouses, 12 belong to non-Jews. Out of 5134 drinking establishments, 5004 belong to Jews. 97%.

On the other hand, in his articles on the "Jewish question" Dostoevsky writes:

*Our opponents point out that Jews are poor, everywhere even poor, and in Russia especially, that only the very top of the Jews are rich, bankers and czars of stock exchanges, and of the rest, almost nine-tenths of them are literally beggars, rushing about for a piece of bread, suggest rent, looking for where to grab a penny for bread. Yes, it seems to be true, but what does it mean ... but the top of the Jews reigns over humanity more and more firmly and strives to give humanity its own appearance and its essence.*

The same idea is confirmed by Sombart with the example of Germany, where, as he says, Jews, until they achieve wealth, tend to live poorer than the surrounding Christian population, since most of their capital is put into circulation, leaving less for themselves to satisfy more immediate needs.

But the big Jewish bankers and "kings of the stock exchanges" (as Dostoevsky called them) were not limited by the "Pale of Settlement" and had a significant impact on the life of all of Russia.

As elsewhere, Jewish influence in Russia was particularly strong in banking. Back in the 19th century. in the south were the influential banks of Rafalovich and Efruss, in Warsaw - Frenkel. Witte writes that Minister Vyshnegradskiy was "like Blioch's confidant in St. Petersburg." Many spheres of life were covered by the El Gintzburg banking house. In 1869 he participated in the creation of the St. Petersburg Accounting and Loan Bank (director - accountant Gintzburg A.I. Zak). The biography (written by

Slizberg) says that the Gunzburg house "was in close friendly relations with the banks of Warburg (Hamburg), Mendelssohn and Bleichroeder (Berlin) ... Gunzburg was related to the bankers Warburg, Hirsch, Herzfeld (Budapest), Ashkenazi (Odessa), Rosenberg (Kiev), Brodsky (Kiev)". Gunzburg received in 1879 permission to engage in gold mining in Siberia and founded enterprises in Transbaikalia and Yautstia. The center of his activity was the "Lena partnership", to which the house "E.M. Meyer" was attracted, and from 1880 Rafalovich and Efrussi. In 1896 the joint-stock company "Lenskoe gold mining partnership" was founded with the participation of Ginz and Meyer. From 1906 English capital began to participate in it through the brokerage firm L. Hirsch & Co. In 1908, the Lena Goldfields Society was founded with directors: Gunzburg, Boyanovsky, Meyer, Champanner. It was at the Lena enterprises of Gintzburg that, as a protest against the harsh working conditions, workers' unrest began, pacified in 1912 by firing squad ("Lena Shooting"). to which the house "E.M. Meyer" was attracted, and from 1880 Rafalovich and Efrussi. In 1896 the joint-stock company "Lenskoe gold mining partnership" was founded with the participation of Ginz and Meyer. From 1906 English capital began to participate in it through the brokerage firm L. Hirsch & Co. In 1908, the Lena Goldfields Society was founded with directors: Gunzburg, Boyanovsky, Meyer, Champanner. It was at the Lena enterprises of Gintzburg that, as a protest against the harsh working conditions, workers' unrest began, pacified in 1912 by firing squad ("Lena Shooting"). to which the house "E.M. Meyer" was attracted, and from 1880 Rafalovich and Efrussi. In 1896 the joint-stock company "Lenskoe gold mining partnership" was founded with the participation of Ginz and Meyer. From 1906 English capital began to participate in it through the brokerage firm L. Hirsch & Co. In 1908, the Lena Goldfields Society was founded with directors: Gunzburg, Boyanovsky, Meyer, Champanner. It was at the Lena enterprises of Gintzburg that, as a protest against the harsh working conditions, workers' unrest began, pacified in 1912 by firing squad ("Lena Shooting").

The Gunzburgs formed a powerful clan, which for several generations played a leading role in the finances (and the entire economy) of Russia. Another such clan was the Polyakovs. The founder of the clan, Samuil Polyakov, became rich on railway construction, subsidized (on preferential terms) by the treasury (for the construction of the Kharkov-Azov railway, Polyakov received a loan of 8 million rubles). His sons Yakov and Lazar were already the largest bankers: the founders of the Donskoy Land and St. Petersburg-Azov banks. In the hands of the Polyakov family was the "Commercial, Industrial and Loan Society in Persia." Its directors were: Drury, Rafalovich, Stefanitsa, Landau, Rubinstein. Lazar Polyakov was the chairman of the Petersburg-Moscow, founder and actual manager of the Moscow International Trade, Yaroslavl-Kostroma, South Russian Industrial and other banks. Yakov Polyakov conducted operations in the south through the Azov-Don, and in the capital - through the Petersburg-Azov bank.

In Odessa in 1910 the bank "A.M. Brodsky" was established, and in 1911 - the Odessa merchant bank with a capital of 3 million rubles, the founder of which was L.A. Brodsky, who represented the bank "A.M. . Brodsky".



In the memoirs of one bank employee, published in 1915 in the magazine "Jewish Antiquity" (vol. 8), it is said: "In people from the Pale of Settlement, a complete metamorphosis took place: a tax farmer turned into a banker, a contractor into a high-flying entrepreneur (...) a phalanx of stock brokers was formed, producing colossal air traffic. A new, cultural nucleus of the Jewish population appeared in St. Petersburg: a new, orderly community arose to replace the old one. "

The significant influence of the Jewish capital was reflected, first of all, in its influence on the pre-revolutionary press. Thus, the official organ of the Constitutional Democratic Party was the daily newspaper Rech. Its editor was Miliukov, co-editor - I.V. Gessen. Tyrkova-Williams writes in her memoirs that Gessen, together with A. I. Kaminka, got money for the newspaper from the Azov-Don Bank, where another Kaminka was the director. The main shareholder in the newspaper was Yu.B. Bak, who made a fortune on railroad deliveries. The latter entered into an agreement with the trading house "L. and E. Metzel and Co", which gave this house the right to advertise in "Rech". Another, "people's" edition of the same party, the newspaper "Sovremennoe slovo" published the same materials, was cheaper and had a larger circulation. It simultaneously served as financial support for Rech, it was financed by the banker G.D. Lesin jointly (which is very typical) with P.P. Ryabushinsky. Its actual publisher was the same Y.B. Bak, and the official one was I.M. Ganfman, as well as V.A. Polyakov, co-owner of the aforementioned house "L. and E. Metzel and Co" and his wife F.N. Polyakova ...

The Marxist historian M.N. Pokrovsky says:

*I know that back in 1907 the Kadet newspaper Nov 'in Moscow was subsidized by some kind of syndicate of the big Jewish bourgeoisie, which cared most about the national side of the matter and, finding that the newspaper did not protect Jews enough, came to our Bolshevik publicist M.G. Luntz (pseudonym - M. Grigorievsky) and offered him to become the editor of the newspaper. He was extremely amazed, he said: how could it be - after all, your newspaper is a Cadet, and I am a Bolshevik. They tell him: it's all the same. We think that your attitude to the national question is clearer. Thus, the Cadet newspaper was actually on the salary of the Jewish bourgeois syndicate, which, as you see, was rather indifferent to the Cadet program.*

There was a group of newspapers designed for the poorly educated urban strata. A typical example is the newspaper "Kopeyka". She was more than once accused of "lack of principle" and "lack of ideology", there was a joke that her political position was expressed in the words: "We trade, father." It was published by the publishing house "Kopeyka", founded in 1897 by MB Gorodetsky, AE Kogan and BA Katlovker. It also published a number of newspapers of the same type: "Zhurnal-kopeika", "Listok-kopeyka", "Petersburgskaya gazeta-kopeika" and others. It was the largest circulation press in Russia. M. M. Gakkebush - Gorelov and B. A. Katlovker were standing behind the scenes.

In addition, there was a type of publication that declared itself as independent. The owner of "Birzhevye Vedomosti" was S.M. Propper, who spoke Russian poorly, who came to Russia without funds, but later became a public councilor of the St. Petersburg City Duma and commerce. The newspaper Den (which had a slightly socialist connotation) was founded with the support of GD Lesin. The Rossiya newspaper was financed by MO Albert. It was published for less than three years and was closed by the authorities for the sensational feuilleton by A.M. Amfitheatrov "The Family of Deceptions" - under that name, who reviled the reigning house. At the publication, Albert personally lost 200 thousand rubles.

A special place in the Russian press was occupied by "Novoye Vremya", thanks to its "anti-liberal" orientation. In particular, there were regularly published "Letters to Neighbors" by MO Menshikov, extremely hostile to Jews (for which he was shot in 1918). Its publisher was A.S. Suvorin since 1876. But after his death, the shares in the partnership that ran the newspaper passed into the hands of Jewish financiers. Rasputin's secretary - Simanovich - a little reliable source - tells about this in detail - but the fact itself is confirmed by the memoirs of many figures of that time. In particular, this issue is discussed in the book by T. Aronson "Russia on the Eve of the Revolution".

In the State Duma, there was a case when, during a discussion of some issue related to the Pale of Settlement, Purishkevich, pointing to the "press box", exclaimed - "Yes, here it is, the Pale of Settlement!" - and the whole hall rolled with laughter. Several older people told me about this. At that time, long lists of Jewish correspondents for Russian newspapers accredited to the State Duma were published. It is difficult to judge the scale of Jewish participation from these lists, since they only include the names of Jewish journalists. But some special impression is made by such combinations as: the newspaper "Rus" is represented by Abilevich Shloma Mendelevich and Stembo Abraham Lazarevich, "Russian Voice" is represented by Stolkind Abram Yankelevich - and so on in a large number of cases. Apparently having in mind such conversations, Tyrkova-Williams says in her memoirs that among the journalists accredited under the First State. Duma, she knew several Russians - she remembered Arkadasky (Russkiye Vedomosti), Skvortsov (Kolokol) and Pilenko (Novoye Vremya).

In conclusion, there was another factor on which then, as now, the financial support of the press depended - the placement of ads. The largest office of advertisements in Russia was the trading house "L. and E. Metzel and Co", founded in 1878. By 1914, it concentrated in its hands more than half of all publishing offices in the cities of Russia and abroad. At the beginning of the XX century. affairs of "L. and E. Metzel and Co" were run by V.A. Polyakov (managing director of the company) and member of the board of the Azov-Don Bank E.P. Epstein. Right-wing sources assessed the situation as follows: "Only a body of a" progressive "direction, and, moreover, strictly adhering to such a coloration, can receive advertisements from this company ... For example, the right-wing newspaper "Russian reading" signed an agreement with the trading house "L. and E. Metzel and Co", according to which she was to receive 30 thousand rubles from this house. per year, however, less than a year later, the agreement was

terminated. But with the cadet newspapers Rech and Russkiye Vedomosti, the same house had permanent agreements and provided most of their income. Thus, the firm guaranteed 330 rubles to the Rech newspaper. for each issue, but only on condition that the newspaper does not change its direction and the staff remains the same. In 1912, a new agreement was concluded, according to which the firm guaranteed income to the newspaper: in 1912 - 155 thousand rubles, in 1913 - 170 thousand rubles, in 1914 - 185 thousand rubles. At the same time, the "progressive" press persecuted the right wing, reproaching it for the much smaller subsidies it sometimes received from the government and firmly attached a label to it. "

However, government subsidies were clearly insufficient to attract qualified journalists or at least lively feathers to the "right-wing press". Those issues of "Zemshina" or "Russian banner" that I happened to see, give the impression of a very low level. The main enemy in them appears to be the "Jew", and everything is considered at the lowest, primitive level: "there are many Jewish pharmacies in Moscow," and so on. I, at least, did not see any attempts to comprehend the already obvious tragic situation in Russia (except when Rozanov was published in Znamya, whose articles cannot be called primitive in any way).

Dostoevsky, who never maneuvered and with the utmost harshness said what he thought, wrote:

*You are now complaining about the Jews in the Chernigov province, but here in our literature there are already many publications, newspapers and magazines published for the Jews' money by the Jews (who are arriving in literature more and more), and only the editors hired by the Jews sign the newspaper or magazine with the Russians name - that's all Russian in them. I think that this is just the beginning, but that the Jews will take over a much wider range of action in literature, and I don't touch upon life, the phenomena of current life - the Jew is spreading with terrifying speed.*

The letter was written on February 28, 1878. If you remove the word "Jew", which has now become abusive, you get an emotional description of the same tendency, which is indicated by dry facts. Of course, a sensitive, deep thinker felt the emerging trend for decades to come. But this is a feature of great minds - and each of us can count the national composition of bank directors or newspaper publishers.

Already in the XX century. Rozanov formulated more harshly:

*All literature is (now) "taken over" by the Jews. Their wallet is not enough: they came "to the soul of the Russian" ...*

## **2. Confrontation.**

In what way was the influence of the Jewish capital on the Russian press expressed? Here it is natural to compare two facts: 1) The overwhelming majority of the

press was "opposition" ("Novoye Vremya" and several right-wing newspapers belonged to a small number of exceptions). Actually, the concept of "progressiveness" also included "opposition", that is, hostility to the structure that existed in Russia at that time, both in its principles and in most of its particular manifestations. 2) Jews were constantly protesting against their situation in Russia. These violent protests did not come only from Jews in Russia - they were heard all over the world. To give one example - the financial relations of the Russian government with foreign banks were almost always accompanied by appeals or demands, turned to the Russian government - to change the existing position of Jews in Russia. In a number of cases, Jewish bankers rejected agreements that were beneficial to them in protest against the position of Jews in Russia. A number of messages from Russian agents are listed, for example, in the "Red Archive" magazine. When in 1905 Witte was negotiating a peace treaty with Japan in America, he was visited, as he says in his memoirs, by a "delegation of Jewish aces" headed by J. Schiff ("the head of the Jewish financial world in America") and demanded changes in the position of Jews in Russia. In case of refusal, Schiff threatened with revolution. There were so many such protests and demands that they can be considered an expression of a point of view shared by the overwhelming majority of the world's Jews - and especially Russia. More broadly, this point of view has taken root in "

What were the main factors of the life of that time that caused these violent protests? First of all: the legally unequal position of Jews in Russia - the protests were formulated as demands for "equality". There were two main restrictions for persons of the Jewish religion: the prohibition of living outside the "Pale of Settlement" (except for the above exceptions) and the "percentage rate". The last measure was that the proportion of Jewish students in state grammar schools and universities was prescribed.

This proportion was based on the assumption that the proportion of Jews in state educational institutions should not greatly exceed their proportion in the population of Russia. Under the Minister of Education Delyanov in 1887, it was determined for gymnasiums and higher educational institutions within the Pale of Settlement - 10%, outside it - 5%, in the capitals (Moscow and St. Petersburg) - 3%. In 1888, Delyanov largely deprived of the force of these measures, allowing the "most worthy" to be accepted without restrictions, and the latter included everyone with an average score of at least 3 1/2. The previous rules were restored by Minister Bogolepov (who was killed by a terrorist in 1899).

In addition to these two main restrictions, there were others: a ban on buying land or settling (re-settling) in rural areas, a ban on being government officials, officers in the army, there was a "percentage rate" for Jewish lawyers ("attorneys at law"). In all cases, Jews were understood as persons of the Jewish faith.

Regarding these restrictions, Shulgin notes that they were not a manifestation of some principle directed exclusively against the Jews. The social structure of Russia was not at all based on the principle of legal equality. First of all, after the liberation of the peasants for them - and this was the overwhelming part of the population - their own laws were in

force: volost courts, laws related to the community, the world, etc. This was all the more clearly manifested under serfdom. Dostoevsky writes about this:

*when a Jew "tolerated a free choice of residence," then twenty-three million "Russian working masses" (in quotation marks Dostoevsky quotes the expressions of his correspondent) suffered from serfdom, which, of course, was more difficult than "choosing a place of residence." And what, then, did the Jews feel sorry for them? I don't think: in the western outskirts of Russia and in the South, they will answer you in detail.*

But the Old Believers were also very severely affected in their rights: for example, their marriages were considered invalid, their children were illegitimate. In Western Russia, the same "percentage rate" existed for the Poles. Many nations were simply in a different position (it is impossible to say unequivocally - in better or worse) than the Russians - for example, they were not taken into the army.

This is only by the end of the XX century. many influential thinkers (for example, von Hayek) began to pay attention to the fact that the law only *formalizes the* principles developed by life. A hundred years earlier, the prevailing belief was that there are some abstract laws in relation to which all people should be in an equal position and life should be subject to this principle. Stolypin also changed the structure of Russian society in this direction. In particular, he proposed to Nicholas II to abolish all restrictions concerning Jews, but he refused.

In relation to the current situation of the Jews, an important role is played by the circumstance noted by Dostoevsky:

*I already know one thing, that there is probably no other nation in the whole world who would complain so much about their fate, minute by minute, after every step and word, about their humiliation, their suffering, their martyrdom. You would think that it is not they who reign in Europe, it is not they who run the stock exchanges there, if only only, but, therefore, politics, internal affairs, the morality of states.*

And indeed, for example, at the Zionist congresses one could hear statements like that the Jews are "the poorest people in the world, not excluding the Eskimos" (Where is the Eskimo Rothschild? - I.Sh.)

Let us also cite a view from the Jewish side. Chaim Weizmann, who later became one of the leaders of Zionism and the first president of the state of Israel, recounts in his memoirs about his youth spent in Russia (he was from the town of Motele near Pinsk). He writes that the "percentage rate" then was for Jews 10% of the total number of students, which seemed to be fair, since in the population of Russia, Jews accounted for (then) 4%. But, he says, as always, Russian laws contained deception. The fact is that the Jews were concentrated within the Pale of Settlement and there - in cities and towns, where they often accounted for 30 to 80%. In addition, they had an irresistible

desire for education. But there were comparatively few non-Jewish candidates in the entrance examinations, and only 10% of this small number were admitted Jews. His book, where he repeatedly speaks of Russia with hatred, vividly conveys the indignation of a Jewish youth. But the point of view of the Russian authorities is also understandable. Let in his hometown Motele the Jews constituted at least 80% of the population. But we were talking about state educational institutions (these rules did not apply to private ones). Why is education created at the expense of the entire population of Russia not divided equally? Why shouldn't the Jewish rich - like Brodsky or Polyakov - open Jewish schools instead of giving money to revolutionary parties and the opposition press? Evaluation very much depends on from whose point of view you look. But we were talking about state educational institutions (these rules did not apply to private ones). Why is education created at the expense of the entire population of Russia not divided equally? Why shouldn't the Jewish rich - like Brodsky or Polyakov - open Jewish schools instead of giving money to revolutionary parties and the opposition press? Evaluation very much depends on from whose point of view you look.

There was another phenomenon in the Russian life of that time, which repelled Jews in Russia, and throughout the world, from Russian statehood, state power, and often from Russia in general. This is what was called "pogroms". The word itself arose outside of any relation to the Jews and, for example, was used in connection with the "pogroms of landowners' estates." But it was gradually reoriented and is now associated only with actions directed against Jews. This remained the standard accusation against pre-revolutionary Russia: "there were Jewish pogroms." Although at the beginning of the century, for example, at the Zionist congresses there was much talk about both "Romanian pogroms" and "English pogroms" (especially in Wales), in the end, the accusation remained with Russia.

It would be fair, of course, to assess all mass manifestations of violence by one yardstick - both directed against landowners and against Jews, and the Armenian-Azerbaijani clashes ... But those in which Jews were victims were reflected in the press (and then in the minds) especially.

The press began to talk about such popular performances from the beginning of the 1880s. They took place in villages located within the "Pale of Settlement". The response to them occupies a large place in the journalism of Ivan Aksakov. He writes that the liberal press is unanimous in characterizing the riots as "the massacre of the Jews." But, he says, "there was no beatings." Although the peasants had both axes and crowbars, the number of beaten Jews did not outweigh the Russians. In 1881, peasants "smashed" Jewish property, often shouting "this is our blood." There were almost no robberies. Sometimes the peasants even tore up the money they came across. Aksakov attributes the riots solely to economic reasons: the difficult situation in which the

peasants found themselves, and many landowners of the Southwestern Territory. According to the rules of the kagal organization, the kagal distributes the right to conduct business in one place or another among the Jews living there with iron severity. (For more details see Chapter 4.) Therefore, a peasant or small landowner could not turn to another reseller, a usurer ... and had to accept the conditions of the one indicated by the kagal. He quotes a letter from one landowner who was subjected to a herem (curse) and a complete boycott, from which he was saved only by turning to a high Galician rabbi.

The riots were pacified by the troops. As Aksakov writes, during the riots of 1883 in the Catherine province, shouts were heard from the Jewish crowd: "Well, have you taken them? You let the fluff out of us, and we are the spirit out of you!" The Jewish Encyclopedia also calls these clashes "beatings." She writes that of the time-based editions, most believed that they originated on an economic basis. (However, Baron Gunzburg presented the authorities with a note from an unmentioned author, which claims that the pogroms were organized.) Two human victims among the Jews are mentioned and it is said: "The soldiers shot and killed several peasants." Rozanov later wrote about pogroms of this type:

*A pogrom is a convulsion in response to agony. The spider sucks on a fly. The fly buzzes. The wings tremble convulsively - and touch the spider, tearing powerlessly and in one place the cobweb. But the fly's legs are already caught in a loop. And the spider knows it. Shouts of pogroms are a rhetorical figure of the suffering of the one who is the master of the situation.*

Apparently, the famous Kishinev pogrom of 1903 had the same "everyday" basis. The first day had the character of ordinary similar riots: several Jewish shops and houses were destroyed. But the police made many arrests and by evening the riots had subsided. However, the next day, the unrest widened. Clashes broke out between groups of Jews and Christians, armed with anything. The police failed to eliminate the riots (although there were attempts). The unrest became more aggressive. Many hundreds of Jewish homes were destroyed. There were human casualties: the most commonly cited figure is 45 murdered Jews and 4 Christians. Now this is roughly the number of victims of riots at a major football match. But, for example, Weizmann writes in his memoirs:

*Herzl arranged a meeting in St. Petersburg with von Plehve, a man whose hands were covered in the blood of thousands of Jewish victims (...) and Herzl arrived in Russia to meet with the Kishinev butcher.*

The troops were called in and by the evening the pogrom subsided. There have been many arrests and trials; those found guilty of murders and pogroms were sentenced to hard labor and other punishments. But in the press (also foreign), further discussed mainly another issue: the accusation of the Russian government in *organizing* pogrom. A. Solzhenitsyn gives an overview of publications on the Kishinev

pogrom (more than 15 pages), where in many cases the lack of evidence of such accusations is evident. But it seems to me that the main argument is expressed by Shulgin (Solzhenitsyn also agrees with him). After the February Revolution, all the tsarist archives were in the hands of former enemies of the government, a commission was created to expose the atrocities of the tsarist regime (and a special commission on pogroms with the inclusion of prominent Jewish representatives) - and no documents indicating the organization of the pogrom by the authorities were published.

But the press was doing its job all over the world (cf. Weizmann's previous statement), and it is possible that Plehve paid with his life for the phantom she created. I think that no publication of facts can help here - the created myth is a more solid part of the mass consciousness than the facts that contradict it.

And yet, these violence from the 1880s to the early XX century. could not be compared with the cruel clashes that had taken place relatively shortly before that in the time of Gaidamatchin, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, etc. on the same lands when they belonged to Poland - when entire Jewish villages were massacred by the Cossacks (and were pacified by the Poles with similar cruelties: Ukrainian rebels were impaled and roasted in great numbers).

The pogroms of the 1905-6 revolution had a somewhat different character. Here we already meet with clashes from both sides of organized groups, often armed with firearms. Shulgin, who witnessed some of them, offers a plausible view of these clashes. He believes that what was called "Jewish pogroms" was part of the revolutionary struggle of that time. He cites a number of testimonies (especially from Kiev, where he lived), according to which the proclamation of the manifesto on October 27, 1905 caused an upsurge of revolutionary actions: the seizure of government buildings, the destruction of monarchist symbols, the tearing up of portraits of the tsar. In cities within the Pale of Settlement, these actions were led by the leaders, among whom there were many Jews. Menshikov quotes from the press of that time:

*Among the giggling crowd of Jews in Odessa was a dog, crowned with an imperial crown on its head, and a Russian national flag was attached to its tail.*

In response, according to this point of view, "pogroms" took place, which were directed against the Jews in the "Pale of Settlement." This was the origin of the Kiev, Odessa, Nezhinsky pogroms. But, for example, in Tomsk, where there were very few Jews, the crowd attacked a revolutionary meeting - and this was not of any anti-Jewish character. As Shulgin writes:

*The pogroms were not directed at Jews alone: they fell upon everyone whom the Russian element, in a convulsive fit of self-preservation, recognized as the causative agents of the revolutionary wave.*

From his point of view, it was these spontaneous actions that stopped the "revolution of 1905" at that time. A detailed description of these events, mainly consisting of



quotations, is given by Solzhenitsyn - an entire chapter is devoted to this in his book. His presentation, in my opinion, convincingly testifies to the events of that time as an armed clash between two currents, and Jews occupied a prominent place in the leadership of the revolutionary movement. Perhaps the priority for this point of view belongs to Nicholas II, who, in a letter quoted by Shulgin, writes:

*the people were outraged by the impudence and audacity of the revolutionaries and socialists, and since 9/10 of them are Jews, all the anger fell on those - hence the Jewish pogroms.*

It is interesting that Weizmann also recalls that time:

*This is how a perverted civil war between the Jews and the Russian authorities unfolded throughout the Pale of Settlement ...*

True, with its own interpretation:

*the former tried to maintain order, while the latter encouraged disorder.*

It is quite plausible that when two crowds collided, of which the portraits of the tsar and the state flag were torn in one, the police and the troops were not sympathetic to this part, and when the other began to prevail, they were hardly in a hurry to come to the aid of the first. The reports of the senators who investigated these riots objectively say about "the inaction of the police and the military, close to connivance." But in the end, the troops restored order - and not much more slowly than the administration of another country would have done.

Pre-revolutionary Russia has not yet mastered 100% Western principles: they killed your father, raped your daughter, ruined you fraudulently - there is a court for that, go there, hire a lawyer society "). Popular movements of such a scale as the Pugachevshchina were no longer possible in it, but their weak counterparts were the popular unrest of 1905-1906. Their scale, apparently, was monstrously exaggerated by the Russian and Western press. Even the Jewish Encyclopedia estimates all the victims of this period at 810 people. But Shulgin quotes a report from the Bliner Tageblatt newspaper about the revolutionary clashes in Kiev in October 1905:

*The horrors reported by the newspapers are nothing compared to reality. Thousands and thousands (abertausende) of Jews killed in southern Russia ...*

There was one more factor that constantly made Russian (and foreign) Jewry hostile to the Russian government. The culmination was the famous Beilis case. These are the occasional accusations of "Jewish ritual murders". In general, human sacrifice on religious grounds (otherwise it was not met) is known in history from antiquity. According to the ancient Greek epic, at the beginning of the campaign against Troy, the Greek leader Agamemnon sacrificed his daughter Iphigenia to the goddess

Artemis. Plutarch describes how already in "historical times", during the Greco-Persian wars, a crowd of Greeks, excited by the priests, sacrificed several captured Persians to the god "Dionysus the meat-eater". Grandiose (in terms of the number of victims) sacrifices were regularly performed by the Aztecs before their conquest by the Spaniards. Europeans found human sacrifices in Africa back in the 19th century. The early Christians were accused of killing babies, and Christians were accused of some splinter sects. In Russia, accusations of such crimes have been repeatedly expressed in the Khlyst sect. The accusation consisted in the fact that in some cases "zeal" turned into a sin ("Christ's love"), the first woman who became pregnant was called "Theotokos"; if a boy was born to her, he was called "christosik", was killed and eaten at a ritual meeting. However, as far as I know, the authorities have never been able to prove that such a crime was actually committed. Accusations of ritual murder pertaining to Jews date back to the early centuries of Christianity. Usually these charges were associated with Easter. They were repeatedly put forward in different countries of Western Europe in the Middle Ages and, although less and less, until the 19th century. A complete and calmly written review of the cases considered in Russia was compiled by VI Dahl, a well-known compiler of the Explanatory Dictionary of the Great Russian Speech and Proverbs of the Russian People. Dahl describes 20 such accusations brought forward in Russia in the 19th century. And, in conclusion, he sets out in great detail the "Velizhskoye case", which was investigated for 12 years - from 1823 to 1835 - about the murder of a 3 and a half-year-old boy, Fyodor Yemelyanov. His corpse was found in the forest and the wounds were of such a specific nature that they ruled out the version of "domestic murder". The local court ruled (1824) that the child was "probably killed by the Jews," but "due to lack of evidence, to release the Jews from suspicion," leaving two " At the request of Alexander I, the case was reopened and a new commission of inquiry was drawn up. In 1829, the commission found the detained Jews guilty. The Governor-General joined her opinion. The case was sent to the Senate, where the votes were divided and the case was referred to the Council of State. His decision was that the accused "as positively not convicted, release from the trial and investigation." Dahl himself clearly believes that ritual killings were committed, but he decisively attributes this not to the entire mass of Jews, but to a certain sect (which for some reason he calls "Hasidim", although the Hasidim were a "sect" only from the point of view of orthodox rabbinism, and not explains why the charges are linked to them). Later there were other cases of ritual killings. At the request of Alexander I, the case was reopened and a new commission of inquiry was drawn up. In 1829, the commission found the detained Jews guilty. The Governor-General joined her opinion. The case was sent to the Senate, where the votes were divided and the case was referred to the Council of State. His decision was that the accused "as positively not convicted, release from the trial and investigation." Dahl himself clearly believes that ritual killings were committed, but he decisively attributes this not to the entire mass of Jews, but to a certain sect (which for some reason he calls "Hasidim", although the Hasidim were a "sect" only from the point of view of orthodox rabbinism, and not explains why the charges are linked to them). Later there were other cases of ritual killings. the commission found the detained Jews guilty. The Governor-General joined her opinion. The case was sent to the Senate, where the votes were divided and the case was referred to the Council of State. His decision was that the

accused "as positively not convicted, release from the trial and investigation." Dahl himself clearly believes that ritual killings were committed, but he decisively attributes this not to the entire mass of Jews, but to a certain sect (which for some reason he calls "Hasidim", although the Hasidim were a "sect" only from the point of view of orthodox rabbinism, and not explains why the charges are linked to them). Later there were other cases of ritual killings. the commission found the detained Jews guilty. The Governor-General joined her opinion. The case was sent to the Senate, where the votes were divided and the case was referred to the Council of State. His decision was that the accused "as positively not convicted, release from the trial and investigation." Dahl himself clearly believes that ritual killings were committed, but he decisively attributes this not to the entire mass of Jews, but to a certain sect (which for some reason he calls "Hasidim", although the Hasidim were a "sect" only from the point of view of orthodox rabbinism, and not explains why the charges are linked to them). Later there were other cases of ritual killings. His decision was that the accused "as positively not convicted, release from the trial and investigation." Dahl himself clearly believes that ritual killings were committed, but he decisively attributes this not to the entire mass of Jews, but to a certain sect (which for some reason he calls "Hasidim", although the Hasidim were a "sect" only from the point of view of orthodox rabbinism, and not explains why the charges are linked to them). Later there were other cases of ritual killings. only from the point of view of orthodox rabbinism, and it is not explained why the accusations are associated with them). Later there were other cases of ritual killings. only from the point of view of orthodox rabbinism, and it is not explained why the accusations are associated with them). Later there were other cases of ritual killings.

The "Beilis case" is in the same chain. Actually, it should have been called "the Yushchinsky case", since the basis of the trial was the murder in Kiev of a 12-year-old boy Andryusha Yushchinsky. His body was found in 1911 with 47 wounds (13 - only on the right temple), which were inflicted in a very specific way, clearly with the aim of bleeding as much as possible while the victim was still alive. The investigation began to develop versions of the Jewish ritual murder, and Beilis was arrested. The investigation was conducted for 2 years and was accompanied by a number of dark circumstances. The most common version, contrasted in print with the version of the investigation, was that it was about *imitation* ritual murder committed by Vera Cheberyak. Both of her children die mysteriously - she is also blamed for their deaths. She claims that Beilis's lawyer Margolin offered her 40 thousand, if only she confessed to the murder, Margolin denies. One of the investigators (Krasovsky) after a while appears in the legal profession of the defenders ...

There was a fuss about the "case" all over the world. The liberal (that is, almost all) press asserted that pressure was exerted on the investigation "from above." The XI

Zionist Congress declared: "In the name of the solidarity of all humane humanity, we demand that the entire cultural world, together with us, join the fight against dark barbarism and help us defend the humiliated human dignity and offended honor of our people." From among the "rightists" Shulgin spoke out against the very fact of the initiation of the process. He wrote: "You yourself make a human sacrifice! You treated Baileys like a rabbit being placed on a vivisection table. Beware! There are temples that cannot be destroyed with impunity." Shulgin believed that the accusation of ritual murders was a way of revenge against the Jews. Do not know, how can you argue this point of view in more detail - who took revenge? - after all, in all ages, the authorities, as a rule, did not support such accusations. (His argument: the "organization" of the process would have been disclosed in the archives after the February Revolution.) On the other hand, Foreign Minister Sazonov assured foreign ambassadors that Beilis would be acquitted - this is also an action by the authorities. Of the well-known names, the version of Jewish ritual murder was supported by Rozanov and Florensky (the latter was published without giving his name). The trial took place in 1913 and lasted 1 month. The jury's ruling was that there was a murder. There are different statements on the question of Beilis's guilt. Menshikov says that the jury's votes were divided: 6 to 6. The Concise Jewish Encyclopedia writes that Baileys was acquitted unanimously. Anyway,

To cover all the materials of the case, it would be necessary, as Shulgin writes, to spend a lifetime. But it seems to me that the question of whether there was a ritual murder and whether Beilis was guilty does not matter either for the history of Russian-Jewish relations or for history in general. In the same way, the question of whether ritual murders were committed among the Khlysty is not a question of Russian history. For example, Merezhkovsky (in the novel "Peter and Alexei") described just such a case - and this did not cause any protests either in Russia or abroad. True, the action of the novel belongs to the times of Peter the Great. But, according to the reaction to the "Beilis case", one can imagine what a cry would have been heard if someone had dared to describe in the novel a ritual murder committed in the Jewish environment, even in the Middle Ages. A significant historical fact was the Russian and world resonance that the "case" aroused. After all, the "mutan case" was heard shortly before, on the accusation of unbaptized Cheremis (Mari) in human sacrifice - and did not evoke a comparable response, no ambassadors asked about its outcome. Yes, and the above-quoted book by Dahl had a straightforward adventure story - the manuscript was stolen from the printing house by "unknown" people, and the set was scattered. And his own book "Investigation of the Scopic Heresy" was in the standard catalog and anyone who wished could purchase it for 200 rubles in silver. Rozanov was expelled from the elite "religious-philosophical society" when he wrote that ritual murders did not contradict the spirit of the Old Testament and the Talmud. But he was a welcome guest there, when he published no less repulsive judgments about Christianity. His previous admiring articles about Judaism were not even read to him: as the NKVD investigators later said about the references to the revolutionary merits of their victims, "and we are not judging you for that." And absolutely fantastic statements were made about the "Beilis case". For example, one fiction writer (SK Efron) wrote that he "swears by Almighty God" that there are no ritual murders among Jews. Others have already relied on the

fact that "all rabbis without exception" deny the possibility of ritual murders, and therefore the investigation is directed - de against "all Jewry". (And moreover, it is insulting for those foreign states where Jews hold high positions - as if denouncing them about Russia). Well, who of the Russians would dare to declare (or swear by Almighty God) that there are no ritual murders among the Khlysty? This would imply the existence of an organization that knows "everything about everyone." Of course, this does not exist. In all the protests there was indignation that "such accusations" are being brought forward "in the progressive XX century." But just a year later, the most progressive countries pounced on each other and exterminated each other for 4 years, poisoning them with poisonous gases. And 30 years later, one of the most progressive countries invented gas chambers and gas chambers, and another, no less progressive, an atomic bomb and dropped it on a peaceful city. These were the murders of not one child, but "victims" by the millions. So progress is clearly not to do with it. that there are no ritual murders among the whips? This would imply the existence of an organization that knows "everything about everyone." Of course, this does not exist. In all the protests there was indignation that "such accusations" are being brought forward "in the progressive XX century." But just a year later, the most progressive countries pounced on each other and exterminated each other for 4 years, poisoning them with poisonous gases. And 30 years later, one of the most progressive countries invented gas chambers and gas chambers, and another, no less progressive, an atomic bomb and dropped it on a peaceful city. These were the murders of not one child, but "victims" by the millions. So progress is clearly not to do with it. nominated "in the progressive XX century." But just a year later, the most progressive countries pounced on each other and exterminated each other for 4 years, poisoning them with poisonous gases. And 30 years later, one of the most progressive countries invented gas chambers and gas chambers, and another, no less progressive, an atomic bomb and dropped it on a peaceful city. These were the murders of not one child, but "victims" by the millions. So progress is clearly not to do with it. nominated "in the progressive XX century." But just a year later, the most progressive countries pounced on each other and exterminated each other for 4 years, poisoning them with poisonous gases. And 30 years later, one of the most progressive countries invented gas chambers and gas chambers, and another, no less progressive, an atomic bomb and dropped it on a peaceful city. These were the murders of not one child, but "victims" by the millions. So progress is clearly not to do with it. millions. So progress is clearly not to do with it. millions. So progress is clearly not to do with it.

And even now in Russia ritual murders take place constantly - either three monks of the Optina Hermitage, or a priest in Siberia ... Moreover, the killers themselves admit that

they acted out of motives associated with mystical experiences. The significance of the "Beilis case" stemmed from the fact that discussion of the version of ritual murder was taboo - and the liberal environment accepted and supported this ban with all passion. That is, the case (as a significant political factor) was created by the opposition press.

The main thing for Russia was that behind these worldwide screams the murdered child was forgotten, thrown away as something not interesting to anyone. The result of the process boiled down to the fact that Baileys was acquitted. Capital was raised for him all over the world by subscription and he left for America. But the corpse of the murdered child remained. If it wasn't Baileys who killed him, then the question remains - who? If Cheberyak, it was necessary to judge her. But this was no longer interesting to anyone. Russian "public opinion" agreed that the fate of Yushchinsky is a negligible value in comparison with the fate of Beilis. That here we are talking about individuals of a different quality, of a different kind. And this is on the example of a situation that is especially intelligible for any person - the murder of a child. As Rozanov wrote: "They will sell not only their banners, not only history, but ... and a certain specific blood of the boy." To accuse Jews of ritual murder, a very special name was created: "blood libel". There was no such term for accusing the Khlysty or Cheremis. In the same way, as in World War II, the losses of Poles, Belarusians or Serbs were called losses, and the losses of Jews were called the "Holocaust", i.e. something fundamentally different.

These were the three main accusations that set up Russian and world Jewry in opposition to the then way of life in Russia: "Jews do not enjoy equality in Russia," "the Russian government organizes Jewish pogroms," "blood libel."

Shulgin recalls:

*Whoever remembers the political Jewish environment of those times, he also remembers its then malice. All this was bubbling with hatred. To whom? To the government and to everything that was behind this government or was protected by this government.*

The same mood is confirmed by a completely different source - one of the leaders of Zionism H. Weizmann. He recalls that during World War I, being in England, he spoke out with hatred about Russia. His interlocutor was surprised - how can a person who sympathizes with England treat Russia like that when she does so much to win. To this, Weizmann, he recalls, replied that "every Russian victory is a nightmare for the Jews."

But it is quite obvious that the "hatred for the government and everything that it guarded", which Shulgin recalls, was not invented by the Jews. Even when it was impossible to talk about any Jewish influence, Pechorin wrote:

*How sweet it is to hate the homeland!  
And eagerly await its destruction.*

Pushkin was able to feel this mood:

*You illuminated your mind with enlightenment,  
You saw the pure light of truth,  
And gently loved foreign peoples,  
And hated your wisely.*

And Dostoevsky in his "Diary of a Writer" more than once drew attention to the lordly, contemptuous attitude towards the people, which turned into hatred of Russia and everything Russian (including the government).

Rozanov wrote in 1914 the article "Wake for the Slavophiles", where he characterizes the attitude of the liberal movement towards them:

*There was no "dispute" and it did not work out ... There was persecution, there was persecution; for seventy years, there was an established strangulation, spitting, splashes of liquid mud that poured from the wheels of the solemn carriage, where the Kraevskys, Nekrasovs, Blagosvetlovs, Shelgunovs, Skabiches, Chernyshevskys, Pisarevs were sitting, - at people who were huddling somewhere in a corner, inaudible, not disassembled not criticized ... So this is the point and this is where the root of the discrepancy lies (...), which determined the course of Russian history for seventy years (...). There was a case about our fatherland, which a number of famous writers pointed out to be understood as the worst enemy of some enlightenment and culture, and there was a case about Christianity and the church, which were indicated to be understood as a barrier of darkness, darkness and ignorance; a barrier and - in its essence - a mistake of history, a superstition, a relic, "that which does not exist."*

Note that in the list of "famous writers" ("sitting in the carriage") there is not a single Jewish name, and this is in Rozanov, who by that time was so illiberal-sensitive to Jewish influence (although, as for Christianity and the Church, he himself in this "carriage" could fit - somewhere "on the irradiation"). But when he writes about the "root of the discrepancy", about its beginning, then he follows the historical truth.

### **3. Russian intelligentsia and Jews.**

At the same time, Jews increasingly entered the Russian educated society and influenced the development of Russian culture. Everyone knows the artist Levitan, the sculptor Antokolsky, the musicians of the Rubinstein brothers (who founded the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories), the collector of Russian folklore Shein - and many others.

The collection "Vekhi", which caused so much controversy, appeared - it was compiled by Gershenzon, and of the 7 authors, three were Jews - Gershenzon, Izgoev (Lande) and Frank.

Different views were formulated on the role of Jews in the cultural life of Russia.

Rozanov thought and wrote a lot about the role of Jewry and Judaism. His relation to all historical Jewry has, as it became fashionable to say later, "the character of love-hate." On the one hand, he considered Judaism to be an ideal, "true" religion, a religion of fertility, clan, family, fullness of life. *Kagal* is the ideal form of community. Christianity, in the continuation of all his literary activity, was presented to Rozanov as a kind of destructive antithesis: a religion that elevates celibacy, virginity to the ideal - and, in conclusion, oriented toward death. He calls himself the Anti-Christian, the Antichrist. In the notes of the last year of his life, he even has a section entitled "I am converting to Jewry."

On the other hand, all the time (except, perhaps, and even then in part, the last, dying year), he pointed to the dangerous social nature of Jewish influence, especially for Russia. So, he wrote:

*Why did you stick to my soul and stick to the soul of every writer that he should HATE THE STATE.*

*They stuck with longing, like jackals howling at the door. I do not want you, I do not want you. Neither the liquid Ol d, Ora, nor the poet Bogoraz. I am Russian. Leave me. Leave us Russians and don't sneak up on us with a whisper: You are an EDUCATED PERSON and a writer and should hate this dastardly government.*

There was also a desire for independence, so as not to succumb to the general trend:

*The liquids can be content that Vl. Soloviev, but Rozanov will not run after them (they tried to "smear it").*

But there were also constantly expressed thoughts:

*He fertilized you, he fertilized you. He came up and told you that what you think about and what you are concerned about is easy to fulfill ... And you do not even notice that it is no longer "myself" and "I", but - "him." The soil which is sown by a Jew and which is plowed by a Jew.*

*And - you perish. "In 100 years" there is no Russian + Jew, but only one Jew + a Russian person who died near him.*

*"Our fields are not from the earth, but from people." That is why we do not plow, we do not plow providentially. For the noblest soil has been prepared for us - man, nations.*

*And I am afraid of this secret of them, and I shout, and I say to my dear Russians: "Don't! Do not associate with the Jews. Otherwise you will all perish." Wait. In 150-200 years the scourge of the Jewish overseer will whistle over the Russian fields.*

*And under the scourge are the bent backs of Russian slaves.*



*There are currently no two dangers for Russia.*

*There is one danger.*

*Jews.*

And if the revolution begins to prevail at all (...), then the Jews will throw off the mask of "sympathy for the Russian people" (...) and quickly strangle, like Gapon and Khrustalev (and just as revolutionary and correct), the *entire Russian part of the revolution, all Russians proper leaders of the revolution*, and, of course, will enter the "gates of the taken fortress" alone! - will enter with shouts: "Rejoice, Russian people - we have given you freedom!" - "Thank us and *bow to us* !" "Tomorrow happiness will begin ..." But today we still have to finish a small thing: to strangle this local police, these small police officers and zemstvo chiefs from the nobility and put brunettes from students in their place, with the names (by that time) Russian, and even baptized ...

(There is something mysterious in the last passage. Judging by the comments of the publisher, this text was written in 1913, and Nosar-Khrustalev was killed by the Bolsheviks in 1919. Perhaps the word "strangle" is understood in the sense of the end of his political career? executed by "Rutenberg.")

In 1897, Chekhov entered into his notebook the following reflections (and it was published for the first time in 1980!):

*Writers such as N.S. Leskov and S.V. Maksimov cannot have success with our criticism, since our critics are almost all Jews who do not know, are alien to Russian indigenous life, its spirit, its form, its humor, completely incomprehensible to them, and who see in a Russian person no more, no less than a boring foreigner. Ostrovsky never had any success with the Petersburg public, mostly led by these critics; and Gogol no longer makes her laugh.*

A. Bely wrote:

*We are in danger of a "stamped culture", i.e. an international factory for the supply of geniuses; we are threatened with the factory production of thoughts ... A terrible censorship is growing in all the depths of these enterprises: only that which is desired by the kings of the literary exchange is translated, advertised and distributed ...*

*Who, who are these ostracists? It's strange and scary to say, but I have to. These are alien people: usually cut off from the nation in the depths of which they live (...) people alien to this culture become the leaders of the national culture; of course, they do not understand the depths of the folk spirit, in its sound, colorful and verbal expression (...)*

*... you look at the lists of employees of newspapers and magazines in Russia: who are the music and literary critics of these magazines? You will see almost entirely the names of Jews ...*

*The general mass of Jewish critics is completely alien to Russian art, writes in the jargon "Esperanto" and terrorizes any attempt to deepen and enrich the Russian language ...*

*And this dependence of the writer on Jewish or Judaized criticism is strictly hushed up: the Jewish publisher, on the one hand, threatens the writer with hunger; on the other hand, a Jewish critic threatens to disgrace anyone who raises his voice in defense of the right of Russian literature to be Russian, and only Russian.*

A letter from Kuprin has been preserved in the archives (in a significant way it was never published in our country until 1990). It was written about a noisy incident caused by the disrespectful comment of the writer Chirikov on the work of Sholom-Ash. The entire press of all shades fell upon Chirikov. Kuprin writes:

*All of us, the best people of Russia (I count myself among them in the very, very tail), have long been running under the whip of Jewish noise, Jewish hysteria, Jewish hypersensitivity, Jewish passion to dominate, Jewish centuries-old adhesion that makes this chosen people just as terrible and strong as a flock of gadflies capable of killing a horse in a swamp. The terrible thing is that we all realize this, but it is a hundred times more terrible that we only whisper about it in the most intimate company in our ear, and we will never dare to say it out loud. You can curse the tsar and even God in print and allegorically, but try a Jew! Wow! What a scream and scream will rise among all these pharmacists, dentists, lawyers, doctors, and especially loudly among Russian writers - for, as one very fine fiction writer, Kuprin, said,*

The author continues:

*And that is why the eternal wanderer Jew, with such a deep, but almost unconscious, instinctive, grafted by 5,000-year-old heredity, spontaneous, blood contempt, despises all our earthly. (...) That is why he devastates forests so brutally, that is why he is indifferent to nature, history, a foreign language.*

But Kuprin ends with a request to keep the letter secret and says that he refused to speak in defense of Chirikov.

But some invisible forces of attraction connected the then progressive intelligentsia with Jewry. Gorky, for example, founded the Russian Society for the Study of Jewish Life, which aimed to combat the prejudices still lingering about Jews. The collection "Shield" in defense of the Jews was published, the editors of which were Andreev, Sologub and Gorky.

In this collection they wrote, for example:

Merezhkovsky:

*What do the Jews want from us? Moral indignation, admission that anti-Semitism is abominable? But this confession was made long ago; this indignation is so strong and simple that one cannot speak about it calmly and reasonably; you can only shout with the Jews. We are screaming.*

O. Sergei Bulgakov (on the Zionist movement):

*There are sacred symbols and world ideas that make the innermost strings of the heart tremble: for example, the Christian Constantinople and the cross on St. Sophia or the deliverance from the hands of the unfaithful of the Holy Sepulcher. The question of Palestine and the dispensation of Israel on the land given and promised by God should have a similar meaning for the Jewish and Christian hearts (I emphasize this "and" three times).*

Viach.I. Ivanov:

*It seems to me that the Jews are our providential testers, and, as it were, the world-historical examiners of the Christian peoples for their love for Christ and for our faithfulness to Him.*

This trend is especially striking if we compare it with the attitude towards the peasantry, once a traditional object of sympathy for Russian liberals and democrats. Back in the 1880s, I. Aksakov wrote that the liberal press constantly stigmatized the "kulak", but would never say a word about a Jew - a usurer or a shinkar.

This amazing gravitation of the progressive trend in Russia towards the Jews - as a nation, ardent and constant love, manifested itself most clearly in Gorky. Beginning with his first stories: "The Legend of the Jew" (1896), "Cain and Artem" (1898). Publicism - "Pogrom", "On the Jews". In 1899, he opposed the position of Novoye Vremya: his open letter to Suvorin, he picks up Pisarev's term: "Vankina literature." But on the other hand, when in 1905 he was charged with distributing literature inciting to overthrow the existing system, he was defended by lawyer O.O. Gruzenberg (later - Beilis' lawyer). In 1906 he went to America, and the American Jews gave him an enthusiastic welcome, which, according to the newspapers, only Garibaldi was honored. In the newspaper of American Jews "Forverst"

*Jews are people with a burning torch raised high, with which they illuminate the human path.*

He was the initiator of the publication of the newspaper "New Life". The money for it was given by A.F. Marsk, B.A. Gordon, E.K. Grubbe (150 thousand rubles each). The editor was N.N. Sukhanov (Gimmer), the leading collaborators were Lozovsky (Dridzo), Steklov (Nakhmkes) and others (Sukhanov cites such information). The director of the newspaper is Solomon Zaltsman.

Together with Andreev and Sologub, Gorky published the "Questionnaire on Anti-Semitism", where he himself answered:

*The Jewish question in Russia is, in terms of its social importance, our first Russian question about the improvement of Russia.*

(In some ways it coincides with Rozanov's assessment.)

In Novaya Zhizn (already July 1917), Gorky wrote:

*There are thousands more pieces of evidence that the Jewish = Bolshevik equation is a stupid equation driven by the zoological instinct of angry Russians. I, of course, will not cite these proofs - honest people do not need them, for dishonest ones they are not convincing.*

Here the deep emotional foundations of Gorky's entire position on this issue are revealed. Some fundamental truths are clear to him without proof, i.e. without discussion ("he, like other honest people" is a strange category in Gorky's lips: were his favorite heroes, Chelkash or Malva, honest people? Maybe only in a very extended, "higher" sense.) Gorky, purely chronologically, do not fit into the framework of this section, we will deal with them later. There are examples of such a passionate love for your people - but so that in another - was there in History?

Something (although, probably, not all) about this mysterious "affinity of souls" noted Rozanov:

*It is not the Russian soul that speaks. In essence, it is not Maxim Gorky who speaks at all. The last one has been replaced, replaced. There is only one ingenious nation in creating fakes. This is said by the "place" of Paris, where the "Russians of the Mosaic Law" live.*

## LITERATURE

Dostoevsky F.M. The Writer's Diary. Sobr. Op. in 30 volumes. T.25. M. 1983.

Bokhanov A. Bourgeois Press and Big Capital. End of the XIX century --- 1914 M. 1984.

Ananich B. Banking houses in Russia. 1816 - 1914 Leningrad. 1991.

Ananich B. Russia and Foreign Capital. (1897-1914). M. Science. 1970.

"Red Archive". T. IV, 1923; vol. VI, 1924; t X, 1925.

A. Subbotin Within the Jewish Settlement. St. Petersburg. 1888.

Tyrkova-Williams A. On the Way to Freedom. New York 1952.

Aksakov I.S. Works vol. III. SPb. 1900.

Pokrovsky M.N. Essays on the history of the revolutionary movement in Russia in the 19th and 20th centuries. M. 1924.

Aronson G. Russia on the Eve of the Revolution. Madrid 1986.

Shulgin V.V. What do we dislike about them? SPb. 1992.

Rozanov V.V. Fallen leaves. Boxes 1st and 2nd St. Petersburg 1912 - 1915.

Gr. Witte S. Yu. Memories. Leningrad. 1924.

Sombart W. Cit. in Ch. 5.

Von Hayek, F. Law, Legislation and Liberty, v. 3, Chicago 1979.

Aksakov I.S. Works, vol. III. SPb. 1905 g.

Weizmann Ch. Trial and error. NJ 1949.

Solzhenitsyn A. 200 years together. M. 2001.

Plutarch. Comparative biographies. Themistocles. XIII.

V.V. Rozanov Collected Works. Fleeting M. 1994. About writing and writers. M. 1995. Apocalypse of our time. M. 2000. The last leaves. M. 2000. Sugarna. M. 2001.

Menshikov M.O. Letters to the Russian nation. M. 1999.

Kuzminsky and Turau. Kiev and Odessa pogroms in the reports of senators Turau and Kuzminsky. SPb. 1907.

Dal V.I. Investigation of the killing of Christian babies by Jews and the use of their blood. 1844.

Chekhov A.P. Collected Works in 30 volumes. T. 17. M. 1980.

Bely A. Stamped culture. "Scales". 1909. September.

Kuprin. A.I. See Chirikov E. On the paths of life and creativity. "Our Contemporary". 1991, No. 9.

Simanovich A. Rasputin and the Jews. Riga (no year of publication).

Sukhanov N.N. Notes on the Revolution. T. 1. Books 1-2. M. 1991.

The secret of Israel. The "Jewish Question" in Russian Religious Thought of the Late 19th - First Half of the 20th Centuries. v. SPb. 1993.

Agursky M., Shklovskaya M. Maxim Gorky 1868 - 1936. (from the literary heritage). Jerusalem. 1936.

## Chapter 11. In the Russian revolution of 1917

### 1. Preparing for the revolution.

Of course, only a certain politically oriented minority of the entire Jewish population of Russia took an active part in the Russian revolution. However, this is the case with all peoples: with Russians and Georgians. The participation of Jews in the Russian revolution is widely known and often discussed. But for the most part, the discussion boils down to one of the extremes. Or it is argued that we are talking about an insignificant, non-fundamental factor that is meaningless (and should not) be discussed. The number of Jews who took part in the revolution was not as great as it is claimed, and they were not Jews, but internationalists who broke with their national roots. And in general, the discussion of this issue is "anti-Semitism". Or, on the contrary, the participation of Jews in the revolution is interpreted as a *determining* factor, its *main* even the *only reason* .

The attempt to recreate a real picture, not deviating to one extreme or the other, finds little understanding. The author has experienced this for himself. In a work written 25 years ago and then circulated in samizdat, I tried to clearly formulate my point of view: "The idea that the revolution was done only by Jews is nonsense, probably invented only to make it easier to refute." But even now, 1/4 century later, I come across statements that I regard the revolution as a "Jewish conspiracy."

I will try once again to collect the main facts known to me that characterize the participation of Jews in the preparation, conduct and approval of the Russian revolution. And this process is very delicate and complex and it seems to me that it is impossible to summarize it with one characteristic.

The very existence of a revolutionary movement, a "revolutionary process" in Russia, apparently has nothing to do with Jewish influence. The largest ideologists who kindled the hearts of the revolutionary youth were: Herzen, Bakunin, Chernyshevsky, Lavrov, Pisarev, Mikhailovsky. There were no Jews among them. The revolutionaries' turn to terrorism begins with the shot of Vera Zasulich, the souls of the terrorists were Zhelyabov and Mikhailov.

But gradually a Jewish trickle begins to pour into this revolutionary stream. Among the galaxy of "sixties", the most influential of whom were Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, Zaitsev, who came from the Jews, occupied a prominent place. (In his memoirs, Tikhomirov writes about him that he came from Jews and hated Russia with some particular hatred.) It was then that Mark Natanson showed himself for the first time, who later played a big role in the revolutionary movement. Already a venerable patriarch, he became one of the leaders of the Left SRs (under the nickname Bobrov) and, when they broke with the Bolsheviks, created a group that supported the Bolsheviks. The participation of Jews in the revolutionary movement at the initial stage can be illustrated by the following figures. Volk's voluminous book "Revolutionary populism of the 70s" filled with a large amount of specific data. consists of 2 volumes, vol. I describes the

events of the first half of the decade, vol. II - the second half. Both volumes are supplied with a list of the names mentioned. If we single out from this list all those somehow connected with the revolutionary movement (terrorists, propagandists, distributors of leaflets, etc.), it turns out that among them Jews accounted for 4-5% in the first period, and in the second - about 10 %. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews. I describes the events of the first half of the decade, vol. II - the second half. Both volumes are supplied with a list of the names mentioned. If we single out from this list all those somehow connected with the revolutionary movement (terrorists, propagandists, distributors of leaflets, etc.), it turns out that among them Jews accounted for 4-5% in the first period, and in the second - about 10 %. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews. I describes the events of the first half of the decade, vol. II - the second half. Both volumes are supplied with a list of the names mentioned. If we single out from this list all those somehow connected with the revolutionary movement (terrorists, propagandists, distributors of leaflets, etc.), it turns out that among them Jews accounted for 4-5% in the first period, and in the second - about 10 %. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews. II - the second half. Both volumes are supplied with a list of the names mentioned. If we single out from this list all those somehow connected with the revolutionary movement (terrorists, propagandists, distributors of leaflets, etc.), it turns out that among them Jews accounted for 4-5% in the first period, and in the second - about 10 %. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and



Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews. In one way or another connected with the revolutionary movement (terrorists, propagandists, distributors of leaflets, etc.), it turns out that among them Jews accounted for 4-5% in the first period, and in the second - about 10%. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews. In one way or another connected with the revolutionary movement (terrorists, propagandists, distributors of leaflets, etc.), it turns out that among them Jews accounted for 4-5% in the first period, and in the second - about 10%. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews. The famous Narodnoye resident Aptekman in the book "Land and Will of the 70s." gives the composition of the "main circle" "Earth and Will". There are 25 people in it and Jews are, apparently, Mark and Olga Natanson, Zundeleovich and Aptekman. In 1877, the "Great Council" of "Land and Freedom" consisted of 17 people, among whom there were 3 Jews. The organizers of the "Black Redistribution" were 18 people, of whom again 3 were Jews.

This small, although ever expanding trickle, however, brought in a very special human material. The main contradiction that tormented the then revolutionary youth was as follows. All of them, of course, were "populists", ready to sacrifice everything, up to and including their lives for the sake of the people. But when, during the period of "going to the people," they encountered this people, it turned out that their ideas and principles are incompatible with the convictions of the people. As soon as they start agitation against the king or God, they were seized, knitted, taken to the police. Moreover, there were cases when the police, not wanting to get involved with the "barchuk", tried to release them, and the peasants demanded a receipt that the agitators were represented in the police - causing displeasure, and often harassment in revenge. The situation was so striking that it left no doubts.

Three paths lay before the revolutionaries, as Tikhomirov vividly describes from personal impressions. You could apply your principle to life that "the people know the truth", or at least admit that they have the right to live according to their convictions. Whoever chose this point of view had to leave the revolutionary movement,

we will not learn about them in his history. The second way was to "enlighten" the people, i.e. through propaganda to change his beliefs. Those who chose this path were sent to the village by paramedics, teachers, etc. But in most cases the life around them - disease, poverty, malnutrition - gave the impression that some of the villages fled, while others were dragged out by this life, and the concerns of the surrounding peasantry overshadowed the goals of the revolution for them. Such for the revolutionary movement were also lost. Finally, *against the* will of the people - either by deceiving, by their own hands, or without it - through terror. The gradation of propaganda literature was quite deliberately developed - what can be given to the people to read, and what to give only to teachers, agronomists and paramedics (against God and the Tsar) - it is "inconvenient" to let the people read. Even fake letters were circulated on behalf of the tsar calling for a redistribution of land or an uprising. Since this path also turned out to be ineffective, the path of terror remained, but with the painful consciousness that this terror is being carried out contrary to the wishes and principles of the deified people.

And here young people appeared for whom all these (in modern terms) "complexes" were completely absent. They did not associate any positive feelings with the people; from childhood, an attitude was instilled in them as to an alien and hostile environment, an "object" of their activity. These people could easily assimilate an abstract scheme and concentrate all their efforts on its implementation. The outlook of this new type of revolutionaries is conveyed, for example, in the memoirs of Aptekman. He's writing:

*I did not know the people, since I was born in the city, I hardly saw the village, and besides, I was a stranger to this people by blood. I didn't know much about Russian history either. Frankly, I did not love her. She seemed very boring to me. And I, so inquisitive and diligent, having read so much on the history of the West, and especially on the history of revolutionary movements in the West, have not read anything on Russian history. It seemed to me that she could not say anything to my mind or my heart.*

Of course, Aptekman writes this only to say that he understood his mistake. But how he corrected it is perhaps even more characteristic:

*Soloviev, Kostomarov, Belyaev, Aristov, Khlebnikov, Shchapov, Mordovtsev, Antonovich and others appeared on my table and read from blackboard to blackboard ... By the spring of 1874 I was completely (!) Ready.*

According to the memoirs, it only took a few months! Whether Aptekman fell in love with Russian history in such a fire and what he understood from it - he does not report this, but then we learn that he went to the people to preach socialism. With regret, he discovered that this propaganda was absolutely not perceived and came to the conclusion: "*... by this we will not defeat the people ...*". Such a complete overcoming of populist sentiments, the ability to consciously take the position of the hostile side (the people must be *defeated* ) - we will not find Aptekman among Russian contemporaries.

In the 60s, at the height of populist sentiments, Zaitsev wrote that "the people are stupid and stupid," that one should not "put them on a pedestal," as the democrats do, but "act decisively against them": again the same motive of the struggle with the people, his conquest.

Another revolutionary, Deutsch, recalls that many Jewish revolutionaries originated from provincial townships and did not even speak Russian as a child. Such was, for example, the childhood of Gesya Gelfman, until she, taking with her a bundle of her things, went to the city "to study goy's science." What kind of look at the people around them from childhood absorbed these young men, brought up in townships ruled by kagals, can be imagined, for example, from the statements of I. Shahak, Alekseev and excerpts from Brafman's book given in Ch. 4.

It might seem surprising that young people, from childhood alien to Russian life, who did not know the people at all, soon became the leaders of the revolutionary movement. In fact, this is understandable - it was they who could free the movement from the burden of old ideas about "serving the people", instilling the view that the people, on the contrary, must be "defeated", "to act decisively against them." And this freed up strength for practical, revolutionary work.

By the beginning of the 80s. the fact that there is a noticeable number of Jews among the leadership of the terrorists has already attracted attention, in particular, this manifested itself in the popular riots directed against the Jews caused by the assassination of Alexander II in 1881. However, how weak was still the Jewish influence among the revolutionaries shows that the fact that "Leaflet No. 6" of Narodnaya Volya hailed these riots as directed against the exploiters (for which they were later repeatedly justified).

1881 was a crisis year in the history of the Russian revolutionary movement. The assassination of Alexander P by a ricochet dealt a heavy blow to the entire movement - both physical and moral. All the forces of the organization were thrown into this murder - and as a result, almost all the leading revolutionaries were arrested. On the other hand, the assassination of the tsar, who freed the peasants, carried out reforms that transformed the entire life of Russia, alienated many from the revolution. In the circle of surviving revolutionaries, almost exclusively in exile, the search for new ideas and new ways began. This "latent period" of the revolution, key for further development, lasted 15-20 years. The revolutionary movement emerged from it with a new face.

And among the new features, one of the most noticeable was the now *predominant* Jewish influence in the leadership of the movement.

Back in 1889, the report of the police department on revolutionary emigration (after the revolution this document was published) lists 146 revolutionaries, of whom at least 50 were Jews - that is, about 1/3!

At the end of the century, the revolutionary movement began to rapidly gain strength. His brightest faction at that time was the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. It is difficult to reconstruct the process of its origin in detail. According to some sources, it arose from the merger of three organizations: the "Foreign Union", the "Workers' Party for the Political Liberation of Russia," operating in the west of Russia, and the "Union of Socialist Revolutionaries" in the north. The organizers of the first were Rappoport and Khaim Zhitlovsky, the second - Gershuni (Gersh Isaak Itskov), and the third - Argunov - the only Russian among them. The Socialist-Revolutionary Party, apparently, was headed mainly by Jews. Gendarme colonel Spiridovich writes in his memoirs:

*The main leaders of this "populist Russian party" were: Gots, Minor, Gershuni, Rubanovich, Natanson, Azef.*

Of the Russians, he can only bring Chernov. Interesting and more private sketches from his own memoirs:

*Their Kiev committee then consisted of Jews. The supporters of the party in Kiev were the Jewish intellectual youth. Gershuni's influence was reflected in the fact that they all raved about terror (...).*

*"Fedor", a Jew, refused to identify himself and presented a false passport. This was an interesting type of ideological, professional itinerant revolutionary. He was a fanatic of his business. Only the Jewish environment provided such workers.*

The soul of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party was the "Combat Organization". It was created and directed by Gershuni from 1901 to 1902, from 1903 to 1906 - by Azev (it is plausible that his surname should be pronounced like this - not Azef - and with an emphasis on A), from 1906 to 1907 - by Zilberberg. In 1907 Nikitenko became the head, but two months later he was arrested. In 1908 it was dissolved in connection with the exposure of Azev's activities.

The role of Azev is very interesting. The two most famous terrorist attacks carried out under his leadership are the assassinations of the Minister of Plehve and the Moscow Governor-General, Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich. Both of them were reputed to be anti-Semites. Plehve was credited (hardly rightly) with organizing the Kishinev pogrom and even (quite fantastically) a plan to put all Jews in the ghetto. Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich re-introduced some restrictions on Jews, canceled by his predecessor. Azev's chiefs in the police department - Zubatov and Rataev - recall that he was simply shaking with anger when he spoke about Plehve. After Plehve's assassination, the leadership of the party in Switzerland held a feast, at which exclamations were heard: "This is for Chisinau." On the other hand, Azev had some kind of special relationship with Gershuni. He falsely testified about him downplaying his role, he threatened that if Gershuni was touched, then he, Azev, would no longer cooperate with the police. Azev handed over to Argunov's organization, which consisted of Russians (were arrested: Argunov, Kolosov, Baranov, Chernov). Finally, the story of Azev's exposure is amazing. When Burtsev presented evidence of his cooperation with

the police, Azev was summoned to the party court. He was unlocked, and the trial was postponed for another day. At night, Azev quietly left. But the Socialist-Revolutionaries killed without any trial and for much lesser crimes against the party. Thus, Tatarov, suspected of betrayal, was tracked down in his parents' house and without any trial was killed in front of their eyes. Then Azev lived in Germany, Burtsev tracked him down and interviewed him, but others allegedly did not know where he was staying. It is difficult to give all this a different explanation than what that the leadership of the party, long before the exposure, knew about the double role of Azev and, for some reason, sanctioned it. And in the light of the above, these considerations were most likely related to the national orientation of both Azev's activities and the party's leadership.

Later, during the elections of city councils (City Dumas) in the summer of 1917, in the Constituent Assembly, the Social Revolutionaries convincingly outnumbered other parties in terms of the number of votes. Therefore, they are worth taking a closer look at.

Here is a short essay on the history of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, extracted from the work of the American researcher Radkay.

At the end of 1901, the author says, there was a merger of two revolutionary groups - "North" and "South", led by Azev and Gershuni. This was the birth of the party. Soon M. Gots and Chernov appeared among the leaders. The organ of the party was Revolutionary Russia, and its editor was Gotz. The author writes: "Gershuni talked about people who gave tens of thousands of rubles to the party, but did not want to become its members. The party also received significant support from the United States, where in such centers as New York, Chicago, Boston there were large colonies of Russian Jews, extremely hostile tsarism ". By the fall of 1906, the party had approximately 50,000 members and 300,000 sympathizers. The militant organization created by Gershuni was independent from the party leadership - in the choice of both its members and victims. Statistics of his terrorist attacks: 1902 - 4; 1904 - 6; 1905 - 51; 1906 - 78; 1907 - 62; 1908 - 3. Azev led the military organization for the longest time. The most sensational terrorist attack was the assassination of Plehve, the Minister of the Interior. Nikolaevsky claims that Azev sought to kill Plehve for some personal reasons, and also because he considered him an anti-Semite.

In exile, Chernov insisted that in Russia the leadership of the party adhere to the principle of "chorus" - as Martov (Tsederbaum), Dan (Gurvich) and Tsereteli among the Mensheviks; Babel, Liebknecht and Kautsky among the German Social-Democrats; Bauer, Renner and Adler - from the Austrian. For the Socialist-Revolutionaries, this "chorus" was supposed to consist of him, Gershuni and M. Gots.

During the war, part of the leadership of the Social Revolutionaries joined the "Zimmerwaldists": Mstislavsky in Petrograd, Sternberg in Moscow, Kogan-Bernstein, Kachinsky and Chaikin in Ukraine. In emigration, the "Left Social Revolutionaries" emerged: Bobrov (Natanson), Kamkov (Katz) and Dalin (Levenson). Evgenia Ratner joined them without the knowledge of her friend Chernov. Chernov and Aleksandrovich

were also Zimmerwaldists. About Natanson the author writes: "He is one of the first generation of populists, did not change his worldview until 1917. Perhaps because of a strong national component in his hatred of tsarism."

The author paints a similar picture with regard to the post-revolutionary period. Naturally, in 1917 the party became more active. Its Petrograd Soviet was headed by A. Gots (brother of M. Gots, who had died by that time) and two deputies: Boldyrev and Lifshits. Breshko-Breshkovskaya then received 2,100,000 rubles from American sources. In May, the third congress took place, where, according to the author, Chernov "lost all claims to leadership and capitulated to the power of A. Gots. There was no scandal and open struggle, just a stronger personality took the driver's seat." There were elections for the Central Committee, where out of 20 elected members, 8 (judging by the names and surnames) were Jews. In the summer of 1917, in most large cities, the Social Revolutionaries were elected city mayors. In particular, in Petrograd - Schrader, in Moscow - Minor. At the VII Congress in August 1917 For the first time, a struggle broke out between the "obronets" and supporters of an early end to the war. The leadership presented a resolution drawn up by the leader of the first trend - Rosenblum and the second - Steinberger.

Almost simultaneously with the Socialist-Revolutionaries, social democracy entered the historical arena in Russia. The first Marxist organization, the Emancipation of Labor group, was founded in 1883 by Plekhanov, Axelrod and Deutsch. The first Social Democratic party in the Empire was the Social Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland, organized in 1893 by Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogisches (Tyszko). The second was the "Bund" - "The General Jewish Workers' Union in Lithuania, Poland and Russia", created in 1897. Many leaders of social democracy emerged from it, the most famous - Martov (Zederbaum), whose first work was devoted to proving that the Jewish proletariat should not, in its struggle, agree to an alliance with the Russian proletariat, for it will surely betray it. For a long time, until 1917, the Bund played the role of a reservoir, from which all streams of social democracy drew leading workers. But among the younger leaders, the conviction began to prevail that closure in a purely national organization was a wrong policy. G. Zinoviev (Radomyslsky) writes about the role of the Bund in the creation of the RSDLP (in his "History of the Communist Party"):

*... in the second half of the 90s. the Jewish workers' movement was very significant and the role of the Bund in the party is very important. Suffice it to say that the Bund was the main organizer of the first congress of our party in 1898. And it was no coincidence that this congress was in Minsk, in the city of the Jewish Pale of Settlement, on the territory of the Bund's activities.*

There were only 9 delegates at the 1st Congress of the RSDLP: Aron Kremer, Abram Mutnik, Shaya Katz, Borukh Eidelman, Nikolai Abramovich Bannovsky, Vigdorchik, Radchenko, Tuchapsky and Petrusevich. The elected Central Committee members were Kremer, Radchenko and Eidelman.

When at the Second Congress the Bund demanded for itself a completely exclusive position in the party, and these demands provoked objections, the representative of the Bund Lieber exclaimed, obviously referring to the role of the Bund in the creation of the RSDLP: only people who do not remember kinship can speak like that! And immediately there were protests and assurances that the merits of the Bund would never be forgotten. Everyone who studied in the Soviet school knows the names of the leaders of the Social Democracy: Martov (Zederbaum), Axelrod, Dan (Gurevich), Lieber (Goldman), Martynov (Picker), Rozanov (Goldenakh), Trotsky (Bronstein), Zinoviev (Radomyslsky ), Kamenev (Rosenfeld), Abramovich, Ehrlich, etc. etc. Plekhanov belonged to an ethnic minority. The editorial staff of Iskra in 1900 consisted of Plekhanov, Axelrod, Zasulich, Deutsch, Martov and Lenin. After the split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, Jewish influence was especially noticeable among the Mensheviks. In connection with the Fifth Congress of the RSDLP, Stalin published an article in the Baku Proletarian newspaper. It says:

*The composition of the congress is no less interesting from the point of view of nationalities. Statistics showed that the majority of the Menshevik faction are Jews, followed by Georgians, then Russians. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of the Bolshevik faction are Russians.*

He explains this by the fact that the Mensheviks represent the interests of the petty bourgeoisie, which is dominated by Jews.

At about the same time, Lenin wrote:

*The number of members of our party is now over 100,000: 31,000 were represented at the joint congress, then 26,000 Polish Social Democrats, about 14,000 Latvian and 33,000 Jewish.*

(33,000 Jewish Social Democrats - this is apparently the Bund, re-admitted to the RSDLP, about the number of Jews among the "Polish" says at least the fact that the organizers of the party were Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogisches; 31,000 "united" - this is most likely the former Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, united at the Fifth Congress, about whom Stalin wrote. The Russians were clearly an insignificant minority).

Stalin's point of view is also confirmed by the fact that (as it became later known), when uniting with the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks created (at a conference in Geneva, 1903) a "shadow Politburo" consisting of: Axelrod, Martov, Dan, Trotsky, Potresov. This is reported by Trotsky's biographer, Deutscher. And the researcher of the history of the Mensheviks Ziva Galili writes: "Among the Mensheviks, representatives of two national minorities of Russia prevailed - Jews and Georgians", "Jewish Marxists came from the wealthy, Russified Jewish strata of St. Settlement ". A similar situation is drawn from the post-revolutionary data. The first conference of Mensheviks after the revolution took place in May 1917. The following were elected to the Party Organizing Committee: Khinchuk, Isuv, Romanov, Zaretskaya, Yermansky,

And in such a little influential trend as anarchism, there is a noticeable Jewish presence. Of course, the creator of the entire movement was Bakunin, and later the most prominent figure was Kropotkin. But with the approach of the revolution of 1905, when the movement becomes more active, Jews are increasingly taking part in it. In the collection of (all known) documents of anarchists, in the introductory article, the compiler of the collection characterizes the situation during the revolution (1905): "Among the anarchists, Jews predominated (according to some samples, their number reached 50%), Russians (up to 41%), Ukrainians (up to 35%) ". (Estimates are very approximate, why the amount turns out to be more than 100%!). In 1903 the publishing group "Anarchy" was created in Paris. In the same collection, its composition is presented as follows: B.Ya. Engelson, M.I. Goldsmith, Roshchin (N.S. Grossman), M.E.R.Dainov, Sh.Kh. Kaganovich, S.M. Romanov and others. The first terrorist anarchist act in the XX century. in Russia made in 1904 by Nisan Farber. In the materials of the anarchists, obituaries (or other references) of the dead or executed terrorists are given. Their full list: Nisan Farber, Aron Elin (Gelinke), Pavel Golman, M. Spindler (Moishe Grodner). F. Zubar, T. I. Bezdyrev, Beinish Rosenblum. Three Jews are also mentioned (one of them is 16-year-old Osip Levin, the rest are not named by name), who refused the services of a rabbi before being executed. After the outbreak of the war, a split occurred among the anarchists: the "defencists" were headed by Kropotkin, the "internationalists" - by Grossman, Ge (Golberg) and Shapiro. After the February Revolution, the movement was again divided. The advice and participation in them were supported by Kropotkin. Geytsman (Chaim of London) objected to him: "Don't go upstairs to rule."

But, despite the large participation of Jews in the anarchist movement, it is not noticeable (unlike the Social Revolutionaries) of any national orientation in the activities of the party. During the 1905 revolution, their organizations were most active within the Pale of Settlement and fought mainly against wealthy Jews. So, their first terrorist attack in the XX century. was committed in 1904, when Nisan Farber killed Abram Kagan in a synagogue in Bialystok. In 1905, B. Friedman threw a bomb into a synagogue in Bialystok, where a group of wealthy Jews gathered (possibly to discuss the lockout issue).

The Socialist-Revolutionaries, Social-Democrats and Anarchists were parties that called themselves *revolutionary*. The Cadets were called only *opposition* party, but, in essence, was a revolutionary party, with the goal of changing the state system. Their role in the First State Duma was very clearly shown in his book by the historian Ger'e. The official leader of the party was Miliukov. But Tyrkova-Williams writes in her memoirs: "Milyukov was surrounded by dark-eyed admirers and especially admirers, to whom he was very sensitive. But it was not he who conducted the choir, but rather he conducted it." It is surprising that Menshikov, in connection with Milyukov, uses the same comparison - "The fake conductor". The actual editor of the official organ of the Cadets, the newspaper Rech, was Hesse. Something about the sources of funding for the newspaper is said in Chapter 10. The Central Committee of the Cadet Party from among the Jews included: Vinaver, Gessen, Izgoev (Lande), Kaminka, Mapndelstam, Petrazhitsky. Menshikov, moreover,



These facts will, however, give a very one-sided view, if we do not note that in the leadership of the Cadets an enormous place was also occupied by landowners and noblemen of the old families, well-known professors (the Cadets were considered a "professorial party"). Tyrkova-Williams lists: Shakhovskoy, Dolgoruky, Radichev, Mukhanov, Svechin, Petrunkevich. Among the professors - Muromtsev, Milyukov. Tyrkova is amazed: and in the program - the forcible alienation of the landlords' lands? But along the way, power was blowing. And the money suddenly poured out. She herself is surprised: in one year her earnings have increased 4 times!

The picture will not be complete if we do not note that since 1916 (in particular, during the February Revolution), Halpern was the head of Russian Freemasonry (secretary of the "Great East of the Peoples of Russia"). (After the February Revolution, he was given the post of Administrator of the Provisional Government). And the position of Russian Freemasonry was formulated by one of its active members as follows:

*The organization is definitely revolutionary and seeks a violent coup.*

Calculations, it seems to me, explain little in such cases, but nevertheless we will give some. MN Pokrovsky asserted: "According to the data of various congresses, Jews make up from 1/4 to 1/3 of the organizing layer of all revolutionary parties." Larin (Lurie) writes that among the arrested and exiled Jews accounted for about one quarter.

At the request of Count Ignatiev, gene. Sukhotin, the commander of the Siberian Military District, cited data on persons under the public surveillance of the police in Siberia on January 1, 1905. They were: Russians - 42%, Jews - 37%, Poles - 14%.

The Bundist and then the Bolshevik Rafes, in his History of the Jewish Labor Movement, cites the figures of the English researcher Rappoport: from March 1903 to November 1904, 384 political prisoners passed through the Aleksandrovsky Ravelin. Of these, Jews - 53.9%, Russians - 26.4%, Poles - 10.4%. Of women: 64.3% are Jewish.

All these figures are close and, apparently, give a correct picture of those members of the revolutionary parties who were actively working. But the situation in the leadership was different, as we have seen. And the policy of these parties (mostly underground) was determined by far from democratic canons. As an example, skipping a decade, let us cite the 7th Congress of the Bolshevik Party in 1918. It was an extraordinary congress due to the threat of a split in connection with the signing of the Brest Peace Treaty (it was called underground). A resolution was adopted there, obliging to keep the decisions made in secret. The chairman even stressed that "Not a single member of the congress has the right to give any information to anyone else." That is, the layer of the party that met in Moscow at that time made very radical decisions (let me remind you that according to the resolution,

Dry numbers can give a false picture. But here is the point of view of the grasping (and not prone to theorizing) observer. Shulgin writes about the "energy and virulence" of the "liberation movement" of 1905:

*to which movement the Jewry gave the spine, the backbone.*

And Stolypin's killer Bogrov was a Jew, and before the assassination attempt, in a conversation with the leader of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party Lazarev, he said: "I am a Jew, and let me remind you that we still live under the rule of the Black Hundred leaders." All this is woven into a riddle. Stolypin once again proposed to abolish all restrictions that existed for the Jews. True, the text of his proposals, rejected by Nicholas II, became known only after the revolution, but it is difficult to imagine that Stolypin's general position was not known in the Jewish environment. Yes, such was the whole spirit of the Stolypin reforms. How, then, can we understand the motive for Bogrov's assassination attempt?

## **2. Revolution.**

But then came the Revolution and all the problems receded before the question of power.

It is interesting to note that in the Provisional Government, how many times it was not shaken up, it seems that there was not a single Jew. True, and his power was rather illusory. It is difficult to say who had the power immediately after the February Revolution - and whether anyone else had it. But the closest to this was the Presidium of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers 'and Soldiers' Deputies - a strange political formation, not chosen by anyone, "by itself" organized. The process of its occurrence is described in detail in his memoirs by Sukhanov (Gimmer). Apparently, the first "exchange of views" took place at ND Sokolov's apartment on February 25th. At least from this "conference" Sukhanov begins his history. He recalls that they gathered by chance: who came to inquire about the news, who was called on the phone. But from later published memoirs it is clear that the meeting was called on the Masonic line. Then, on February 27, the "Provisional Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies" met in the Tauride Palace. Its composition: Bogdanov, Gvozdev, Kapelinsky, Grinevich (Shekhter), Skobelev, Chkheidze, Francorussky, Sokolov, Erlich. On the basis of it, through co-optation, a permanent Executive Committee was created. So, already on the 28th, Stalin and Rafes (who was soon replaced by Lieber) were included in it. And so it went on: "The Executive Committee invited those who had arrived from among those who had obvious services to the movement," explains Sukhanov. So, on March 15th Larin (Lurie) and Uritsky arrived, after another 2 weeks - Martov. On the 19th, Tsereteli and Gots returned from exile, on the 28th - Dan, on the 31st - Kamkov (Katz). Finally, on April 3rd - Lenin and all the companions in the "carriage". that the meeting was called on the Masonic line. Then, on February 27, the "Provisional Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies" met in the Tauride Palace. Its composition: Bogdanov, Gvozdev, Kapelinsky, Grinevich (Shekhter), Skobelev, Chkheidze, Francorussky, Sokolov, Erlich. On the basis of it, through co-optation, a permanent Executive Committee was created. So, already on the 28th, Stalin and Rafes (who was soon replaced by Lieber) were included in it. And so it went on: "The Executive Committee invited those who had arrived from among those who had obvious services to the movement," explains Sukhanov. So, on March 15th Larin

(Lurie) and Uritsky arrived, after another 2 weeks - Martov. On the 19th, Tsereteli and Gots returned from exile, on the 28th - Dan, on the 31st - Kamkov (Katz). Finally, on April 3rd - Lenin and all the companions in the "carriage". that the meeting was called on the Masonic line. Then, on February 27, the "Provisional Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies" met in the Tauride Palace. Its composition: Bogdanov, Gvozdev, Kapelinsky, Grinevich (Shekhter), Skobelev, Chkheidze, Francorussky, Sokolov, Erlich. On the basis of it, through co-optation, a permanent Executive Committee was created. So, already on the 28th, Stalin and Rafes (who was soon replaced by Lieber) were included in it. And so it went on: "The Executive Committee invited those who had arrived from among those who had obvious services to the movement," explains Sukhanov. So, on March 15th Larin (Lurie) and Uritsky arrived, after another 2 weeks - Martov. On the 19th, Tsereteli and Gots returned from exile, on the 28th - Dan, on the 31st - Kamkov (Katz). Finally, on April 3rd - Lenin and all the companions in the "carriage". Chkheidze, Francorussian, Sokolov, Erlich. On the basis of it, through co-optation, a permanent Executive Committee was created. So, already on the 28th, Stalin and Rafes (who was soon replaced by Lieber) were included in it. And so it went on: "The Executive Committee invited those who had arrived from among those who had obvious services to the movement," explains Sukhanov. So, on March 15th Larin (Lurie) and Uritsky arrived, after another 2 weeks - Martov. On the 19th, Tsereteli and Gots returned from exile, on the 28th - Dan, on the 31st - Kamkov (Katz). Finally, on April 3rd - Lenin and all the companions in the "carriage". Chkheidze, Francorussian, Sokolov, Erlich. On the basis of it, through co-optation, a permanent Executive Committee was created. So, already on the 28th, Stalin and Rafes (who was soon replaced by Lieber) were included in it. And so it went on: "The Executive Committee invited those who had arrived from among those who had obvious services to the movement," explains Sukhanov. So, on March 15th Larin (Lurie) and Uritsky arrived, after another 2 weeks - Martov. On the 19th, Tsereteli and Gots returned from exile, on the 28th - Dan, on the 31st - Kamkov (Katz). Finally, on April 3rd - Lenin and all the companions in the "carriage". - explains Sukhanov. So, on March 15th Larin (Lurie) and Uritsky arrived, after another 2 weeks - Martov. On the 19th, Tsereteli and Gots returned from exile, on the 28th - Dan, on the 31st - Kamkov (Katz). Finally, on April 3rd - Lenin and all the companions in the "carriage". - explains Sukhanov. So, on March 15th Larin (Lurie) and Uritsky arrived, after another 2 weeks - Martov. On the 19th, Tsereteli and Gots returned from exile, on the 28th - Dan, on the 31st - Kamkov (Katz). Finally, on April 3rd - Lenin and all the companions in the "carriage".

It is worth remembering that the chairman of the "Petrosovet" was Chkheidze, a Freemason, while Russian Freemasonry was then led by Halpern. He writes in his memoirs: "I conducted the main negotiations with the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, ie Chkheidze." This was greatly helped by the "brotherly" connection. Often he said: "Why are you wandering around, after all, our people think this is wrong, you need to fix it and do it our way." The organ of the Council was Izvestia, and its editor was Steklov (Nakhamkes), one of the most influential personalities at the time. When the first meeting of the representatives of the Provisional Government and the Council took place, the Council was represented by three people, two of whom were: Steklov and Sukhanov.

Plekhanov, who returned from emigration, said that, according to his observations, Russian revolutionaries had changed: before they were blue-eyed blondes, and now "all the comrades are all black, with a southern accent." He probably thought he was entitled to such jokes, since he was married to Rosa Bongard. But is it any wonder that he lost all influence! Plekhanov's observations can be checked against lists of revolutionary emigrants who arrived from Switzerland via Germany to Russia in March 1917 - these lists were later published by Burtsev. Thus, list No. 1 consists of 29 persons, of whom 20 are undoubtedly Jews. In list No. 2, the proportions for S.-D. - 38 out of 63, for S.-R. - 10 out of 17, S.-D. Kingdoms of Poland and Lithuania - 2 out of 3, the Polish Socialist Party - 2 out of 3 and, of course, for the Bund, Poalei Zion and Zionist Socialists - 100%. In addition, there were "

Regarding the February Revolution of 1917, Shulgin says:

*Someday history (if it is not obscured, crushed, and falsified) will tell this process. Living witnesses, eyewitnesses, from this time left an indelible impression: Jews and Georgians - Georgians and Jews.*

The situation in "revolutionary democracy" clearly characterizes such a dramatic episode. Immediately after the October coup, the largest and most influential trade union, VIKZHEL (railway workers), refused to recognize the new government and demanded an agreement between all socialist parties, otherwise threatening a strike. The so-called "Meeting at VIKZHEL" took place, the participants of which were (according to the "Protocols of the Central Committee"): from the Menshevik defencists - Dan (Gurvich) and Erlich, from the Menshevik internationalists - Martov (Tsederbaum) and Martynov (Picker), from the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries - Heidelman and Jacobi, from the left - Kolegaev and Malkin, from the "Committee for the salvation of the motherland and revolution" - the Menshevik Weinstein, and from the Bolsheviks - Kamenev (Rosenfeld), Sokolnikov (Brilliant) and Ryazanov (Goldenakh). (The All-Russian Council of Peasants' Deputies and the Union of State Employees were also represented. The names of their representatives were not given.) It was these people who then decided the fate of Russia. Then it turned out that the representatives of the Bolsheviks did not even have the authority to conclude any agreement, but dragged out the negotiations in order to give the new power to strengthen. At a meeting of the Central Committee of November 1 (14), Lenin said that "the negotiations were supposed to be a diplomatic cover for military operations." This, however, was obvious during the negotiations, but for some reason it was beneficial for the audience to pretend that they did not understand the situation, and they together broke a comedy. that the representatives of the Bolsheviks did not even have the authority to conclude any agreement, but dragged out the negotiations in order to give the new power to strengthen. At a meeting of the Central Committee of November 1 (14), Lenin said that "the negotiations were supposed to be a diplomatic cover for military operations." This, however, was obvious during the negotiations, but for some reason it was beneficial for the audience to pretend that they did not understand the situation, and they together broke a comedy. that the representatives of the Bolsheviks did not even have the authority to conclude any agreement, but dragged out the negotiations in

order to give the new power to strengthen. At a meeting of the Central Committee of November 1 (14), Lenin said that "the negotiations were supposed to be a diplomatic cover for military operations." This, however, was obvious during the negotiations, but for some reason it was beneficial for the audience to pretend that they did not understand the situation, and they together broke a comedy.

As the Bolsheviks gained strength, Jewish influence spilled over from the Mensheviks to them - now what Stalin wrote about the Fifth Congress of the RSDLP no longer reflected reality at all. Whether the Bolshevik leader himself was 1/2 or only 1/4 Jewish is not at all important. Much more important is how he felt himself. Once Lenin himself touched on this issue. In a conversation with Gorky, he noticed that a Russian person is clever, "oh, how rare." "A Russian clever man is almost always either a Jew or a person with an admixture of Jewish blood."

With a certain Leninist modesty, it is impossible to imagine that he would exclude himself from the ranks of the "clever men". An even more important indicator is that he worked all his life and achieved a leading position in an environment where the majority were Jews, and in especially crucial cases relied almost exclusively on Jews. So, after the revolution, the chief of Lenin's security was Chekist Belenky. Such a delicate operation as a financial connection with the Germans in 1917 was entrusted to almost only Jews. It was attended by Parvus (Gelfand), Ganetsky (Furstenberg), Uritsky, Radek (Sobelzon), Sumenson. Of the other participants (whose names were known), Vorovsky (Orlovsky) was, apparently, a Pole and only Kozlovsky - perhaps a Russian.

In general, the leadership of the Bolsheviks to October consisted to a large extent of Jews. For example, a political bureau (the prototype of the future Politburo) was created to prepare the uprising. Composition: Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, Stalin, Sokolnikov (Brilliant), Bubnov. That is, the Jews prevailed, and the Russian here is only Bubnov.

The October coup took place. In the period immediately following this, power was not in the hands of the Soviets, of course; not a party; not even the Central Committee, but three people: Lenin, Sverdlov and Trotsky. Sverdlov, long before Brezhnev, united in one person the post of head of state (chairman of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee) and secretary of the Central Committee (then the only one). Trotsky was at the head of the army, Petrograd was headed by Zinoviev, Moscow by Kamenev, foreign policy was led by Radek, the Comintern by Zinoviev, and the press by Steklov. First, Oskar Ryvkin was at the head of the Komsomol, then Lazar Shchatskin replaced him.

Even more striking, virtually all non-Jewish leaders had Jewish wives. So, Dzerzhinsky's wife was Sonya Mushkat; one wife of Bukharin was Gurvich, the other was Lurie; Rykov's wife was Marshak, Molotova - Zhemchuzhina (Pearl Karpovskaya), Voroshilova - Gorbman, Kirov - Markus, Yezhova - Evgenia Solomonovna Notkina, Kuibysheva - Kogan, Andreeva - Khazan.

It gives the impression that during this period someone who was not a Jew did not have at least some Jewish ancestors, in order to enter the upper stratum of persons in power, to become his own person there, he had to have a Jewish wife. An exception was possible for a Georgian like Stalin; it was not allowed for a Russian. And after all, it continued this way until Marshal Zhukov (1st wife) and Brezhnev.

An amazing fact, which cannot be ignored, was the massive participation of Jews in the Cheka. Whatever memoirs of that time you take, you come across the names of Jewish security officers: in Odessa - Citizen (Kudemsky), Grishin (Klyuvgant), Rover, in Kiev - Remover, Rozanov (Rosenblat), Sokolov (Shostak), Buvshstein, in Kharkov - Abugov, Dagin, Dagansky, Mazo, Ostrovsky, Portugeis, Sharov (Shaver), Feldman, Yesel Mankin, in Nikolaev - Alekhin (Smolyarov), Weinstein, Spektor, in the Ukraine and Crimea - Guy (Stockland), Dmitriev (Plotkin), Govlich ( Vayner), Kaminsky, in Perm and Vyatka - Berman, in Pskov and Novgorod - Passov, in Voronezh - Rapoport, in Arkhangelsk - Katsnelson, and even in Siberia - Bak, Yuzhny, Bermans (both brothers), in Turkestan - Gerzhot, Dimentman, Kaplan, Slutsky, in Samarkand - Pauker, in the Far East - Litvin, during the elimination of the officers of the Wrangel army who surrendered prisoners -Earth (Zalkind) and Bella Coon. And in the capitals: Petrograd - Uritsky (head of the Cheka), Vezager, in Moscow - Leplevsky, Messing, Gendin, Rapoport. In the Special Department of the Cheka - Agranov, Aliyevsky, Pauker, in the secret department - Genkin, etc., etc. And at the top: Feldman is the head of the investigative department of the Cheka, Trilisser is the foreign one, and among the members of the Cheka collegium there are Yagoda, Uritsky, Zachs (Left Socialist Revolutionary). Melgunov (completely following liberal norms), speaking of one book (not available to me), devoted to the era of the Civil War, writes: "In its concluding lines, the book takes on an openly anti-Semitic character, which makes it possible to talk about its tendentiousness. We somehow got used to not trusting literary works that come out of the pen of persons who are unable to rise above the template of zoological feelings of narrow chauvinism. But information coming from sources of other origins confirms much of what is said in this book. "And he, apparently, is right! Any description of the terror of that time, unless it is specially processed, will (using liberal language)" take anti-Semitic character. "This also applies to Melgunov's book itself.

Shulgin gives a list of people who were in command positions of the Kiev Cheka: out of 20 names there are 4-5 Russians, the rest are Jews. He's writing:

*But if there were not a single Jew in these local emergency situations, then even then these massacres would have been the work of Jewish hands, for the reason that the Communist Party, on whose behalf all this was done, was led by Jews on an all-Russian scale.*

But there remains the fact of a very significant *personal* participation of Jews in the implementation of the terror. It's *dangerous*- constituting an insignificant minority in the country, so decisively take one side in the civil war, rinse with such passion in the blood of the indigenous population. For this purpose, performers from the general population can also be found in each country. In a journal now published in Israel in Russian,

analyzing a historical novel from the pre-revolutionary era, the critic M. Perakh reproaches the author for not depicting the Pale of Settlement and the percentage rate, and without this it will not be clear "where did the cruel commissars come from. in leather jackets with Mausers on the side, not pronouncing the letter er. " Those. he explains the phenomenon under discussion by hatred caused by the restrictions of the Jews in pre-revolutionary Russia. If so, it reveals very specific features of the Jewish character, for the Pale of Settlement or the percentage of education received were not comparable either with the Tatar yoke or with the Polish invasion in the time of troubles. And besides, the position of the Jews was constantly improving, during the war, restrictions were lifted for family members drafted into the army, and after the February revolution they received all possible rights.

Martov expresses a similar idea in his memoirs. He came from the wealthy Odessa Zederbaum family. When he was 3 years old, a pogrom took place in Odessa. He was stopped and did not reach their house. But remembering, Martov writes:

*Would I have been what I have become if Russian reality had not hastened to capture its rough fingers on the plastic young soul and carefully preserve salvific hatred under the cover of pity stirred up in a child's heart.*

A completely new factor is revealed here. We have always believed that the revolutionaries were driven by "love for the people" - no matter how peculiarly it was understood; finally, the desire to make the socialist utopia a reality. But it turns out that one of the incentives was also "salutary hatred" - was it only Martov's? Obviously, there were some reasons that made it attractive to direct, personal participation in the Cheka, the shooting of the royal family, the persecution of the Orthodox Church - despite the danger of forever sowing enmity between our people and the bulk of the population.

In The Writer's Diary, Dostoevsky says:

*... sometimes a fantasy entered my head: well, what if it were not Jews in Russia, three million, but Russians; and there would be 80 million Jews - well, what would the Russians turn to and how would they treat them? Would they have allowed them to freely equal themselves in rights? Would you let them pray freely among them? Wouldn't they be turned directly into slaves? Worse: would you not flay your skin at all? Would they not have beaten to the ground, until the final extermination, as they did with foreign peoples in the old days, in their ancient history?*

Sadly, Dostoevsky's "fantasy" almost came true in reality: it is true, not so that the proportion of Jews and Russians changed, but due to the fact that at some point their strength was in such a ratio, as if there were several dozen Jews times more Russians. And it cannot be said that the result turned out to be completely different from the one that Dostoevsky imagined.

Shulgin writes (addressing the Jews):

You complained that there were Jewish pogroms during the rule of the "Russian historical power"; these pogroms before the *all-Russian defeat*, which was perpetrated during the eleven years of your omnipotence, seem like children's toys .

Of course, this "all-Russian defeat" was carried out not exclusively by Jewish hands, but by the communist government. But this does not remove the question of why the Jewish forces took part in the "defeat" with such enthusiasm. The entire era of war communism consisted of a continuous series of peasant uprisings, pacified by the central government. This is usually interpreted as a "fight for bread", a very cruel way of implementing food appropriation. But case studies do not support this view. In an overwhelming number of cases, the authorities simply went to war against the peasants. It was about some kind of incompatibility. Not an economic operation, it was more like the religious wars that Western Europe had gone through earlier. For example, in the Voronezh province, the surplus appropriation was carried out by citizen Margolin. The witness says:

*Upon arrival in the village or parish, he gathers the peasants and solemnly declares: "I have brought death to you, scoundrels. Look, each of my pro-army men has one hundred and twenty lead deaths on you, scoundrels," and so on. Then the requirement to fulfill the food allocation begins, and then flogging, planting in a cold barn, etc.*

That is, in the first place was death, and only then, as a decoration, the surplus appropriation appeared.

The history of the so-called "decossackization" is known in more detail. We are talking about a system of measures directed against the Don Cossacks during the period when, as it seemed, communist rule was established there (late 1918 - early 1919). These measures were previously discussed in the surviving correspondence between Sverdlov and A.A. Frenkel. Frenkel was one of the members of the Donburo (the chairman was Syrtsov), but it was he who wrote to Sverdlov, and he also signed a number of decisions concerning the Cossacks. Apparently, it was some kind of confidant of Sverdlov. So, Frenkel poses the question:

*There is a very large and complex work to destroy, through a number of measures, mainly in the agrarian question, the kulak Cossacks as an estate that constitutes the core of the counter-revolution.*

As a result, in January 1919, the Organizing Bureau of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) (along with the Politburo, one of the leading organs of the party), headed by Sverdlov, receives a "Circular Letter on the attitude towards the Cossacks", which begins like this:



*1. To carry out mass terror against the rich Cossacks, exterminating them without exception, to carry out a merciless mass terror against all Cossacks who took any direct or indirect part in the struggle against Soviet power.*

These measures were implemented: a number of reports of mass executions in the villages survived. In February, the "Instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front for the implementation of the directive of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) on the fight against counter-revolution in the Don" was published, containing instructions:

*... detect and immediately shoot:*

*a) all, without exception, Cossacks who held official positions by election or by appointment ...*

*f) all, without exception, rich Cossacks.*

Signatures - Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front: I. Khodorovsky, V. Gitis, A. Kolegaev. Administrative manager of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front V. Plyatt.

The appeal (with the same signatures) says:

*Concentration camps are needed with the complete removal of the Cossack element from the Don region.*

All these measures were vigorously implemented, as there is a lot of evidence. Mass shootings took place. As a result of "decossackization" the number of Don Cossacks decreased from 4.5 million to 2 million. The result (in March 1919) was the Upper Don Uprising. In the fight against him, the Revolutionary Military Council of the 8th Army pointed out:

*... all those who have something to do with the uprising and anti-Soviet agitation must be destroyed, without stopping at the percentage destruction of the population of the villages. (Even without restrictions on gender and age! - I.Sh.)*

Signatures: Revolutionary Military Council of the 8th Army, I. Yakir, J. Vestnik.

### **3. The question of power.**

Many tried to express the Jewish influence (Shulgin even spoke of "omnipotence") after the October Revolution in numerical form, on the basis of various calculations. For example, lists are given that give the impression of an almost one hundred percent concentration of Jews in power. But it seems to me that this very much depends on the choice of the body whose list of members is given. So, the first composition of the Council of People's Commissars was: Lenin, Trotsky, Rykov, Milyutin, Nogin, Lomov, Stalin, Shlyapnikov, Teodorovich, Glebov-Avilov, Antonov-Ovseenko, Krylenko, Dybenko, Lunacharsky - he gives a different picture. But one must bear in mind that the

Council of People's Commissars is an executive body. (Yes, and Trotsky said: "it would be much better if there were not a single Jew in the first revolutionary Soviet government." Although, apparently, it was simply impossible to do without him). In addition, for example,

Real power belonged (as the dissatisfied Bolsheviks said at the congresses) - to Lenin, Trotsky and Sverdlov. At the funeral of Sverdlov, Lenin said that he generally decided many issues on his own. If we talk about some body, then the power was - the Politburo. Its first embryo was, apparently, a committee created at a meeting at Sukhanov's house on the eve of the coup. We have already cited its composition: Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, Stalin, Sokolnikov, Bubnov. At the VI Congress, the Politburo was not elected, but there was a "Bureau of the Central Committee" - Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, Sverdlov. At the 7th (extraordinary) congress, the Politburo was again not elected. It was revived at the VIII Congress, consisting of: Lenin, Kamenev, Krestinsky, Trotsky, Stalin. Then she was absent from the IX Congress. Further, its composition was:

X Congress: Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev;

XI Congress: Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Tomsy;

XII Congress: Lenin, Kamenev, Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev, Rykov, Tomsy, Bukharin;

XIII Congress: Kamenev, Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev, Rykov, Tomsy, Bukharin.

This is up to 1924 - the entire period of the revolution and its establishment. The Politburo consisted of 5-7 people. Of these, Leni - by his own definition, "a person with an admixture of Jewish blood" and 2 or 3 more Jews. According to modern terminology, this was a "controlling stake" (if we also recall the wives of Bukharin and Rykov). Whatever forces created the "miraculous relationship" of which Gretz speaks (in the quotation given in Chapter 1), most members of the Politburo of any composition were subject to their action. while.

But in such delicate matters, the impressions of one contemporary give more than lists and calculations. Shulgin, for example, talks about the time of the Civil War:

*In the Red Camp, Jews abounded in numbers, which is already important, but in addition they occupied commanding heights, which is even more important.*

He speaks of "a fact that was clearly protruding," from his point of view, constituting the "essence of the matter":

*the organizational and guiding force in the camp of the Red Army were Jews.*

As an example, he cites the White Army, where it is generally accepted that the officers were the leading force. Although many former officers fought in the ranks of the Red Army.

*However, it never occurs to anyone to say that the Communist Party was led by officers; and, on the contrary, everyone says with confidence that the White movement was led by officers. Why? Yes, because in the Red Camp the Russian officers were in the role of "cattle", and in the White - they were the "leading class".*

*Precisely such a leading class were the Jews in the Red Camp.*

It seems that in the Bolshevik camp the problem was felt. For example, in 1923, Trotsky recalled at the plenum of the Central Committee that immediately after the seizure of power

*Vladimir Ilyich, lying on the floor, said: "Comrade Trotsky, we will make you the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs, you will crush the bourgeoisie and the nobility."*

but he refused:

*we must not give such a trump card into the hands of our enemies.*

As well as the proposal to become Lenin's only deputy:

*so as not to give our enemies a reason to say that Russia is ruled by a Jew.*

The American Sovietologist R. Pipes writes:

*Trotsky was the only Jew in the Council of People's Commissars. Apparently, the Bolsheviks feared accusations that they were a "Jewish party" that had created a government that would serve the interests of "international Jewry".*

Speaking at a different plenum of the Central Committee, Trotsky said:

*You remember what harm was done to us in the Civil War by the fact that a Jew stood at the head of the Red Army.*

(If he really thought so, then it is not clear why he appointed Sklyansky as his deputy - both for the Revolutionary Military Council and for the People's Commissariat for Military Affairs.

Regarding the entire revolutionary movement - both before and after 1917 - the book "Russia and the Jews", published in Berlin in 1923, seems to me to be a balanced testimony of the role of the Jews. how the relations of their people with other peoples of Russia will develop in the future. Here's what they write.

*There is no doubt that the number of Jews who participated in the Bolshevik Party, as well as in all other parties, contribute so much to the so-called deepening of the revolution - Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc. both in number and in the role they played as leaders, it does not correspond in any way with the percentage of Jews in the entire population of Russia. This is an unconditional fact that must be explained, but which is senseless to deny. (Levin) Now the Jew is in all corners and at all levels of power. The Russian person sees him at the head of the first capital of Moscow, and at the head of the Nevskaya capital, and at the head of the army, the most perfect mechanism of self-destruction. He sees that St. Vladimir Avenue bears the glorious name of Nakhimson, the historic Liteiny Avenue was renamed into Volodarsky Avenue, and Pavlovsk into Slutsk. The Russian man now sees the Jew as both a judge and an executioner. (Bikerman)*

*The ranks of the socialists were overflowing with Jews. And when, along the lines of Russian state destinies over Russia - so to speak - socialism struck along with the revolution as a manifestation, result and factor of nationwide disintegration and popular decay - then these Jews with all their numbers and energy found themselves on the forefront of decay. (Landau)*

*The Jew armed and held together with unparalleled cruelty the Red regiments, which defended the "conquests of the revolution" with fire and sword; on the orders of the same Jew, thousands of Russian people, old men, women were thrown into prisons in order to make Russian officers shoot their brothers with the pledge of their lives ... ( Bikerman)*

In recent times, a representative of the "third wave" of emigration S. Margolina writes:

*The question of the role and position of Jews in Soviet history is one of the most important and, at the same time, the most tabooized questions of our time ...*

*A special and almost unexplored issue is the work of Jews in repressive bodies: the Cheka, the GPU and the NKVD ...*

*Say what you like, but the horrors of the revolution and the Civil War, as well as the subsequent repressions, closely merged with the image of the Jewish commissar.*

Again from the collection "Russia and the Jews":

*... in this turmoil, Jews take an active part as Bolsheviks, as Mensheviks, as autonomists, in all qualities, and all Jewry as a whole, since it does not make a revolution, relies on it and identifies itself with it so much that a Jew -the enemy of the revolution is always ready to declare an enemy of the people. (Bikerman)*

The connection between Jews and revolution, noted in the last quote, was symmetrical. If the Jew is the enemy of the revolution, the Jews declared the enemy of their people, then the new government declared the enemy of the Jews its enemy. Izvestia of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of June 27, 1918 published a message "From the Council of People's Commissars." It says:

*The Council of People's Commissars declares the anti-Semitic movement and the pogroms of Jews to be the death (! - I.Sh.) of the cause of the revolution (...). Pogromists and those leading pogrom agitation are ordered to be outlawed.*

The law to outlaw someone seems to be unique in history.

In the Criminal Code adopted in 1922, Article 83 prescribed:

*For inciting ethnic hatred in especially aggravating circumstances - punishment before execution.*

Another certificate belongs to S.S. Maslov, a well-known specialist in agricultural cooperation, a deputy of the Constituent Assembly. In the early 1920s, he emigrated (or was he exiled?) And described what he had experienced before in Soviet Russia. He's writing:

*The widespread expression "Jewish power" very often in Russia, especially in Ukraine and in the former Pale of Settlement, is understood not as a shameful definition of power, but as a completely objective definition of its composition and its policies. When a Ukrainian peasant calls his horse-drawn and labor duty "Jewish panshchina", he expresses only his sincere conviction that the panshchina was really introduced by Jews.*

*The definition of power as "Jewish" has a double meaning: Soviet power, firstly, meets the desires and interests of Jews, and secondly, power is actually in the hands of Jews. A characteristic everyday fact that reflects the first meaning of the definition of power: if a Jew, even personally familiar to the interlocutors, approaches a group of persons (not Jews) who are freely talking about the Soviet order, the conversation almost always ends abruptly and turns into another plane.*

At the same time, when S.S. Maslova (in 1922), an article by E. Kuskova appeared in the émigré newspaper "Jewish Tribune" (first a member of the "Liberation Movement", then trying to organize a committee to help the starving in Russia - in the nickname PROKUKISH, given by the Bolshevik press to this committee, she belongs to "KU" - and then expelled from the USSR). The article is called "Who are they and how to be?" She conveys her impressions of Russian-Jewish relations in Soviet Russia. A Jewish woman, a doctor, says:

*The Jewish Bolshevik administrators spoiled my excellent relations with the local population ... And this population now treats me disgustingly, and I feel disgusting.*

Or a teacher:

*You see, the children hate me, they shout out loud that I teach in a Jewish school. Why Jewish? Because it is forbidden to teach the Law of God and they*

*kicked out the priest. - Yes, I have something to do with it? After all, the order was given by the People's Commissariat of Education? - Yes, because in the People's Commissariat of Education there are all Jews, and you are appointed by them.*

Kuskova quotes a proclamation from the "Political Administration" (People's Commissariat for Education?), Explaining why "there are so many Jews":

*When the Russian proletariat needed its own intelligentsia and semi-intelligentsia, cadres of administrative and technical workers, it is not surprising that the opposition-minded Jewry went to meet him ... proletarian.*

But maybe those Jews who occupied a leading position in the socialist movement and in the Russian revolution were a minority in Jewry itself, cut off from their national roots? Perhaps their position evoked condemnation of Jews who are true to their national traditions? Indeed, such voices were heard - this is, for example, the meaning of the book "Russia and the Jews", which we quoted above (the authors spoke on this issue not only as theoreticians: one of them, Pasmanik, collaborated, for example, with the government of Denikin and Wrangel). But it is in this book that the authors assure us that they have met with hostility and alienation from the bulk of Jewry. So, the Jewish press wrote about them:

*There are Jewish elements there that cannot be counted. These are the dregs of the Jewish community, akin to Wrangel and having come all the way with his army ...*

The article by M. Bikerman tells about the banquet of Russian-Jewish public figures in exile and about the speech of one Americanized Jew who said:

*Jews have nothing to complain about Russia, we have always noted with satisfaction the cases when in England or France an outstanding Jew reached power ... now in Russia almost half of the ministers are Jews.*

The following is a story about one Jewish leader (the author calls him a "white raven") who proposed to a high Jewish clergyman to organize a protest against the executions of Orthodox priests in the USSR. That, thinking, replied that this would mean fighting against the Bolsheviks, which he does not consider possible to do, since the fall of the Bolshevik regime would lead to Jewish pogroms and thus his hands would be stained with Jewish blood. The author summarizes:

*public opinion of Jewry all over the world turned away from Russia and turned towards the Bolsheviks.*

*A French, English or American Jew is not obliged to think about how to get Russia out of the abyss, into which she was plunged by a senseless rebellion called revolution, and he has only one thing left about Russia and the affairs of the Russians: the existing power of the Bolsheviks is already beneficial because*

*it does not allow Jewish pogroms; it is threatened by "reaction", which is ready to exterminate the Jews.*

This last thought finds confirmation in an unexpected source. In his polemic with Trotsky over the terror in Russia (in fact, this is a response to Lenin's article "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky"), Kautsky writes:

*What we fear is not a dictatorship, but something, perhaps, much worse. Most likely, the new government will be extremely weak, so that it will not be able, even if it wants to, to cope with the pogroms against Jews and Bolsheviks. ... therefore we are forced to defend it (Bolshevism - I.Sh.) as a lesser evil.*

(Although in the very title of the book the author characterizes the situation in Russia as "state slavery".)

That is, the attitude to the communist government as "the power that protects the Jews from pogroms" turns out to be in the first place for Kautsky, despite all the party disagreements that existed.

The book "Russia and the Jews" repeatedly discusses the connection between the politically active part of Jewry and the rest of the mass:

*The point here was not the huge number of active party people, socialists and revolutionaries who joined it (revolution - I.Sh.); the point is the widespread sympathy with which she was met, and to some extent accompanied by and later*

*...*

*It is clear that there were some strong motives that pushed the Jews in this direction. (Landau)*

*How many Jewish bourgeois or bourgeois families were there, where parents, bourgeois and bourgeois did not look sympathetically, sometimes with pride, and, in extreme cases, indifferent to how their children were stamped with the current clichés of one of the revolutionary socialist ideologies? (Landau)*

Otherwise, the same idea is formulated by Shulgin:

*... it is unfair to think that modern Jewish communists appeared, like Venus, from the foam of the sea. No, they are a terrible child of the massive Jewish malice that gripped a large part of Russian Jewry in 1905-1906.*

The same feeling permeates the memories of one of the founders of the Zionist movement H. Weizmann. He says more than once: "with my hatred of Russia" - as something self-evident.

And for a later time (1919) Shulgin gives a specific example of widespread Jewish support for Bolshevism:

*... I could observe in Odessa Jewish work against the Volunteer Army (...). This was during the French intervention. The decay of the French army that came to Odessa was done to a large extent by the anti-white hum of Odessa-mama.*

Documents confirming Shulgin's observation are published in the Soviet journal Krasny Arkhiv. According to reports received by the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian Directory, Margolin, such a picture emerges. The chief of staff of the French occupation forces was Colonel Freudenberg. He is negotiating with the Ukrainian Directory, focusing on the federalist socialists. The commanders, Generals Franche-d, Espere Berthelot and Anselma, look at everything with his eyes. His policy boils down to discrediting the Volunteer Army. Under his influence, Shulgin's newspaper Rossiya was closed and the rich Novi Shlyakhi was allowed to open. His policies discourage mobilization into the Volunteer Army, where he is called "the evil genius of the Allied Command." At the same time he intrigued against the Volunteer Army "

The attitude of the nationalist, Zionist Jewry to the revolution is very vividly characterized by the resolution of the Zionist congress held in Petrograd after the February revolution. The resolution insists that Jewish candidates in the Constituent Assembly, if possible, pass on the Jewish lists, if this is not possible, then the Zionists pledged to support the parties "not to the right of the People's Socialist Party." The "People's Socialists" were a more moderate faction of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Thus, the Zionists were ordered to vote only for socialist, revolutionary parties.

Of course, the post-revolutionary period was not just an era of "Jewish power" - if only because such a concept was not proclaimed, and we already know that without a clearly formulated concept it is impossible to carry out a radical (and even such a radical!) Coup. A completely different concept was proclaimed - the international-communist one. And it is impossible that many tens of thousands of Jewish communists were in fact "Marranos", secretly professing a different doctrine - and no one would ever let it slip: not then, not later.

But you can't get away from the facts. They talk about some extremely significant "Jewish factor" in the revolution.

It is not true that, at least during some period of the revolution, "all" or "almost all" revolutionaries were Jews. But after the October Revolution, the country was divided into two camps: "for" and "against" the revolution (peasant uprisings, Civil War, emigration). We have seen that the pro camp did not consist entirely of Jews. But maybe they weren't in the "against" camp? And this cannot be said clearly. Of course, many Jews associated with the February Revolution were out of place after the October Revolution. They did something in the territories of the white governments, they went, in the end, in exile. There were many of them. But the decisive fighters against the revolution among the Jews were, apparently, exceptions. For example, Uritsky's killer is Kanegisser, who shot Lenin Kaplan, and Pasmanik, cited above. Such exceptions were



also 6 authors of the book "Russia and the Jews" - they fixed their position of "outcasts" from the Jewish environment. As Shulgan writes:

*Only an insignificant group of Jews joined the Whites. True, Vinaver personally visited Yekaterinburg, that is, so to speak, visiting Denikin. He arrived jointly with Milyukov. But both the one and the other were plucked worse than the Two-Headed Eagle of the Kerensky era. We can say that together they weighed little. (...) Vinaver because ... yes, precisely because Jewry did not go in the White Movement (...)*

*This was explained by the fact that there was such anti-Semitism in the Volunteer Army that it was impossible to breathe (...) This is partly true. But only partly. There is no doubt that if Jewry rushed into the White armies with the same passion as it worked for the Red Army, then there would be no anti-Semitism in the White camp.*

We meet the same idea in the book "Russia and the Jews":

*In an army with many Jewish soldiers, anti-Semitism would suffocate. (Linsky)*

So Shulgin, having discussed two extreme positions:

- 1) All Jews are communists;
- 2) Not all Jews are communists, but all communists are Jews;

comes to a conclusion that seems to him "very close to the truth":

- 3) Not all Jews are communists; not all communists are Jews; but in the Communist Party, Jews have influence inversely proportional to their numbers in Russia.

This is certainly true, but it seems to me that it is only part of a more general phenomenon, which is as follows. At the beginning of the XX century. Russia has gone through a crisis associated with the revolution that shook it - since 1905. And if it is permissible to operate with such categories as "nobility", "peasantry" - then, obviously, and "Jewry" - then undoubtedly "Jewry" *as a whole* in this crisis everything turned out to be on the side of the revolutionary communist. Both in the sense of a completely disproportionate participation in the revolution and communist power, and in the sense of an equally disproportionate participation in the struggle against these forces. Of course, practically none of them took part in the struggle of the peasants and very few in the White armies. Well, can Vinavera, Martov, Abramovich — and Milyukov, of course — be considered fighters against the revolution? They were just its active participants, but at a certain phase - "February" - and during the transition to the "October" phase there was a change of characters and they found themselves "out of the game" - in emigration. Yes, Vinaver devoted the last years of his life not to the "fight against communism" (at least to the newspaper), but published the newspaper "Jewish Tribune" in Paris and,

In the crisis that split Russia then, the question is hardly legitimate - who was right? It looks more like a natural phenomenon. But for the fact that "Jewry" as a whole turned out to be on one, definite side, both numerical calculations and observations of both Jews and Russians speak; both intellectuals and Ukrainian men; both the books of white emigrants and the statement of the Political Department of the People's Commissariat for Education. And not only on the "one side" - but also the guiding force and support of this "side".

We have cited many evidences (and much more could be cited) of the hostility of "Jewry" to "historical Russia", which was reflected in the revolution as well. Of course, the tradition of this hostile attitude was created by the Russians, even in the beginning - by the Russian aristocrats. But this tradition was adopted by the Jews almost entirely (albeit with different shades). And here it is very risky to make a priori decisions about what was the "cause" and what was the "effect." (If history can be broken down into a chain of "causes" and "effects" at all.) The generally accepted point of view is that "inequality," "Jewish pogroms," "blood libel," and so on. caused the enmity of Jewry to Russia, an influx into the revolutionary movement, and after the revolution - "coming to power." But can this point of view be verified? How can you be sure that the opposite point of view is not true: that it was precisely this hostility and will to rule that was primary, and only as a result of this such a violent reaction was caused by the "restriction of freedom of movement" and everything else? Indeed, much more cruel harassment was suffered from the kagal organization - Russian ministers still did not boil Jews in boiling water! And we did not see crowds of Old Believers rushing to the Cheka or the Communist Party. It seems to me that this question can be answered only by carefully thinking over our recent history, comparing it with similar situations among other peoples. But not taking on faith a hastily produced intellectual stamp. but only as a result of this, such a violent reaction was caused by the "restriction of freedom of movement" and everything else? Indeed, much more cruel harassment was suffered from the kagal organization - Russian ministers still did not boil Jews in boiling water! And we did not see crowds of Old Believers rushing to the Cheka or the Communist Party. It seems to me that this question can be answered only by carefully thinking over our recent history, comparing it with similar situations among other peoples. But not taking on faith a hastily produced intellectual stamp. This question can be answered only by carefully thinking over our recent history, comparing it with similar situations among other peoples. But not taking on faith a hastily produced intellectual stamp. This question can be answered only by carefully thinking over our recent history, comparing it with similar situations among other peoples. But not taking on faith a hastily produced intellectual stamp.

## LITERATURE

- Tikhomirov L. Beginnings and ends. Liberals and terrorists. M. 1890.
- Wolf S.S. Revolutionary populism of the 70s of the XIX century t.f. 1.2. M. 1964.
- O.V. Aptekman "Land and Freedom" of the 70s, Rostov-on-Don. b.g.
- Tikhomirov's unpublished notes. Red Archive. vol. 29. 1928 g.
- Zaitsev V.L. Selected Works. T. 1.M. 1934.
- Deutsch L. The role of Jews in the Russian revolutionary movement. M.-L. 1926.
- Chronicle of the socialist movement in Russia. 1878-1887. M. 1907.
- Spiridovich. Notes of the gendarme. Kharkov. 1930.
- Nikolajevski B. Aseff the Spy. N.-Y. 1934.
- Radkey Oliver R. The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism. N.-Y.-L. 1958.
- Martov Yu. Notes of a Social Democrat. M. 1924.
- Shapiro L. Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Firenze. 1975.
- Zinoviev G. History of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Lgrd. 1924.
- Ziva Galivi. Leaders of the Mensheviks in the Russian Revolution. M. 1993.
- Stalin I.V. Compositions. T.2. M. 1946.
- V. Lenin. The quote is given in the book by Silnitskiy "The National Policy of the CPSU", Washington 1990. With reference to the IV edition of the Collected Works of Lenin Vol. II, p. 168.
- Deutscher The Prophet armed. Trotsky: 1879-1921 N.-Y.-L. 1958.
- Anarchists. Documents and materials. Vol. 1. 1883-1913. M. 1998.
- Gerrier R. First Russian State Duma. M. 1906.
- Tyrkova-Williams A. Cit. in Ch. ten.
- Menshikov M.O. Letters to the Russian nation. M. 1999.

Menshikov M.O. Letters to Neighbors for 1907 "Lovely Scolds ..."

Startsev V.I. Russian masons of the XX century. History Questions. 1989 N 6, History of the USSR. 1989. No. 6; 1990. No. 1.

V.V. Shulgin Cit. in Ch. ten.

Perah Mark. "Facts or Selection of Images?" In the magazine "Time and We". Israel, February 1976

Dostoevsky F.M. Cit. in Chapter 1.

The newspaper "Literary Russia". 1990. N 2

Larin Y. Jews and anti-Semitism in the USSR. M.-L. 1929.

Red Archive. T. 32.1929, N1.

Rafes M. Essays on the history of the Jewish labor movement.

Rappoport Angelo S. The Pioneers of the Russian Revolution. L. 1918.

Second Congress of the RSDLP. Protocols. M. 1959.

Correspondence between Stolypin and Nikolai Romanov. Red Archive. T.5. 1924.

Egor Lazarev. In the book "The Murder of Stolypin". NY. 1986.

Minutes of the Central Committee of the RSDLP. August 1917 - February 1918. M. 1958.

V.V. Shulgin Cit. in Ch. ten.

Dostoevsky F.M. Cit. in Chapter 1.

The newspaper "Literary Russia". 1990. No. 2.

Soviet village through the eyes of the Cheka-OGPU-NKVD. Vol. 1. 1918-1922. M. 1998.

Antonovshchina. Peasant uprising in the Tambov province in 1919-1921, Tambov. 1994.

Philip Mironov. Quiet Don in 1917-1921, M. 1997.

Bugai N. Cossacks - representatives of the Russian people. In the collection "Russian people. Historical destinies in the XX century." M. 1993.

Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers 'and Soldiers' Deputies. M. 1997.

Minutes of the congresses of the RSDLP-VKP (b): the second edition is the most accessible, since 1958. The first edition (20s) in several places differs in more radical formulations.

Trotsky. See "Questions of the history of the CPSU". 1990. No. 5.

Pipes R. Russian Revolution. M. 1994.T.2.

Russia and Jews (collection). Cit. in Chapter 1.

Margolina Sonja. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Maslov S.S. Russia after four years of revolution. T. T. 1, 2. Paris. 1922.

Kautsky K. From democracy to state slavery. Berlin. 1921.

Weizmann Ch. Quoted in Ch. ten.

Red Archive. T. 19.1926.

The tragedy of the Soviet village. Vol. 1. May 1927-November 1928.

Zaslavsky K.A. Stalin's empire. Biographical encyclopedic dictionary. M. 2000.

Who led the NKVD 1954-1941. Directory. M. 1999.

Melgunov S.P. The Red Terror in Russia 1918-1923. M. 1990.

## Chapter 12. West between the World Wars.

(from I to II World War)

### 1. After the war.

In a strange way, Jewish influence in the world increased dramatically during the periods of the world wars. We have already mentioned the Napoleonic Wars, which brought equality to Jews throughout Western Europe, coinciding with the emergence of the Jewish press (and economically empowered Jews who created fortunes on the funding of both sides. The rise of the Rothschild House dates back to this time.) Later we will meet with the same phenomenon on the example of World War II. Now let's turn to World War I.

The phenomenon of interest to us can most clearly be traced to the example of Germany. The war demanded concentration of economic efforts and regulation of the economy. Back in 1912, the Berliner Tageblatt newspaper, created in the 19th century, a Jewish publisher, and who promised to defend Jewish interests in the first programmatic article, wrote:

*To govern Germany well today means to be able to count well, and this is what Sim's children have always been able to do. Nowadays, in places that are decisive for our destiny, we need people who can count, make forecasts in the sphere of material values. Is it so bad to draw them from the Jewish race? Doesn't it testify to Wilhelm's wonderful instinct that he always invites the director Ballin, Simon, Goldberger, Hermann, Arnold, Rathenau, Schwabach, Friedlander-Fuld to his palace at a difficult moment?*

With the outbreak of the war, the leadership of the mobilization of economic life for military purposes was transferred into the hands of two economic dictators: Rathenau and Ballin. Ballin took over as head of the Central Purchasing Society. Rathenau headed the Department of Strategic Planning at the War Department. A network of "Military Societies" was organized based on private initiative, but supported by the state. In their hands, in fact, was the economic life of Germany. At the head of this entire system was Rathenau, whom the press called "the chief of the general staff behind the front lines," a figure vividly illustrating the nature of Jewish influence in Germany before, during and after World War I. The son of one of the largest industrialists in pre-war Germany, Rathenau wrote in his youth in his book Impressions (1902):

*Listen Israel! Judophiles say: the Jewish question does not exist. But it is enough to walk on a Sunday afternoon along the Torgartestrasse or cast a glance at the theater foyer in the evening. Strange affair! In the heart of German life, we see a very special, strange race ... Among the sands of Brandenburg you notice the "Asian horde". The mastered gaiety of these people does not allow the ancient and unquenchable hatred that they carry on their shoulders to break*

*through. Closely connected with each other, strictly isolated from the outside world, they do not form a living organ of the German people, but a special organism, alien to their body.*

Rathenau inherited his father's fortune and became one of the largest industrialists and financiers in Germany. In 1909 he wrote in the Vienna newspaper Neu Freye Press:

*300 people who know each other personally decide the fate of the continent.*

And another time:

*The time has come for influential international financial circles, which have long concealed their power over the world, to proclaim it openly!*

Recalling his impressions of the beginning of the war after the end of the war, he quoted a conversation with a friend:

*I said: the moment will never come when the Kaiser, as the conqueror of the world, will ride on a white horse under the Brandenburg Gate. On such a day, world history would lose its meaning.*

Nevertheless, he was entrusted with the post of economic dictator of Germany, and he accepted it. The well-known economist, Nobel Prize laureate von Hayek, believes that it was "in the Rathenau offices" that the foundations were laid for the coming to power of the National Socialists: the bureaucratization and centralization of the economy, begun during the war, led to the fact that by the year 33 the economy of Germany could only a dictatorship is in charge. But Rathenau and through numerous publications promoted the idea of unification and centralization of the economy. Hayek writes:

*Perhaps more than anyone else, he influenced the views of his contemporaries. And some of his closest collaborators later formed the nucleus of the apparatus that carried out the Hering Four-Year Plan.*

According to memoirs from this era, the "Military Societies" were overwhelmed with Jews. A book devoted to this issue gives such examples (although it may be extreme, but there is nowhere to go further). Here is the composition of the leadership of the Textile Supply Society: Kon, Zeitlin, Gershfield, Samilevich, Geller, Eisner, Sommerfeld, Feitulberg, Simon, Platner, Simon (one more!), Vilner. In the "Military Metallurgical Joint Stock Company" Germans accounted for 13%, Jews 87%; in a society that was in charge of supplying leather, Germans 2%, Jews 98%. "Societies" and the firms belonging to them paid unheard-of dividends: 300, 400, 700 and even 900%. Speculations made it possible to win millions in a few days. Wealths in the hundreds of millions were created. All the time, both during the war and after its end, there were trials: the supply of fake goods, speculation, abuse of office with a clear preponderance of Jewish names. Several times Gelfand-Parvus, a participant in the Russian revolution of 1905, a propagandist of the theory of the "permanent revolution",

but at the same time a millionaire speculator, along with his permanent employee Shklyarts, was put on trial. After the war, when the Social Democrats were in power, Parvus's party comrades, in connection with another scandal, Minister of Cults Henisch made the following statement to the newspaper "8 ur abendblatt": together with his permanent employee Shklyarts. After the war, when the Social Democrats were in power, Parvus's party comrades, in connection with another scandal, Minister of Cults Henisch made the following statement to the newspaper "8 ur abendblatt": together with his permanent employee Shklyarts. After the war, when the Social Democrats were in power, Parvus's party comrades, in connection with another scandal, Minister of Cults Henisch made the following statement to the newspaper "8 ur abendblatt":

*As for the operations of Parvus, there may be some really risky ones, I do not know this, then please do not forget that Parvus is not a correct German philistine and, thanks to all the path he has traveled, he cannot become such. In his veins, undoubtedly, Jewish, Russian (? I.Sh.) and Tatar (?? I.Sh.) blood are mixed in a very peculiar way. Such a person has the right to be judged by the laws of his own being and the life he has lived.*

(This Henish - minister of cults! Was the editor-in-chief of the Gloke magazine published by Parvus and Shklyarts.)

When Germany occupied Ukraine in 1918, Secretary of State Busche-Haddenhausen told the Reichstag commission that grain purchases (ie, actually confiscation) in Ukraine would be entrusted to "Jews who know local circumstances." In Austria-Hungary, the "Society for the Import of Grain" was organized for the same purpose. Its leadership: Kohn (chairman), Reif and Werfel (deputies), Fischl, Gibian, Gehorham, Horowitz, Hermann, Levy, Jay, Verheimer,

In the countries of the opposite camp, a similar picture can be seen, primarily with regard to the centralized management of the economy. For example, in the United States, the economic dictator was Bernard Baruch (analogue of the German Rathenau). He was at first a stock speculator, but during the war he headed the military-industrial complex - the War Industry Board.

He characterized the work of the military-industrial complex as the development of "Priorities" - for example, "whether to send steam locomotives to General Pershing (in the army) or to Chile for the transport of saltpeter. Necessary for the manufacture of ammunition for Pershing's troops."

His opponents accused him of establishing an economic dictatorship and called him a "super-president."

After the war, he strove to consolidate the experience of the military-industrial complex:

*The need to regulate not only prices, but also capital, labor, production.*



*This cannot be achieved without the authority, control and leadership of industry, sufficient to organize and manage it as a single whole system. A completely new approach is needed, in which every plant and every raw material, every entrepreneur and worker is part of one giant industrial army.*

In the 1930s. Baruch advocated the creation of plans to mobilize the American economy for the next war, which he considered necessary for the United States. (He wrote that he was simply obsessed with this idea.) "I don't know such an animal," he said of sovereignty. At the same time, as an argument, he used the fact that Hitler uses the experience of the military-industrial complex - completely parallel to what Hayek said about Rathenau's influence on the Hering Four-Year Plan.

In the field of finance, Paul Warburg (an analogue of the German Ballin) played a similar role, and until 1914 he was a co-owner of the Hamburg banking house of the Warburgs, headed by his brothers. (One of these brothers, on behalf of the German government, even tried to contact the Russian politician Protopopov in Stockholm in a failed attempt to probe the possibility of a separate peace with Russia.)

Here is an example concerning already high politics. British billionaire Henry Ford traveled to Europe in 1917 in the hope of achieving peace. He later wrote:

*Every time I tried to get through to a minister or a crowned person, a Jewish secretary would block my way at the door. Without their consent, I could not get through to those in power. Therefore, I came to the conclusion that it is they who hold the power in Europe.*

And, indeed, at various times the secretary of Lloyd George was Philip Sassoon, Asquith - Edwin Samuel Montague, Clemence-Mandel, Loubet - Hugo Obendorfer.

D. Reed draws attention to the increased role of Jewish influence in world politics on the example of the following incident. At the beginning of 1918, a large contingent of British troops was transferred to Palestine to completely cleanse it of the Turks, despite the fact that it was natural to expect a decisive German offensive on the Western Front using the troops liberated on the Eastern Front. The decision was clearly very controversial and was made under great pressure - to implement it required the dismissal of several politicians and military leaders. Indeed, the German offensive began 2 weeks after the start of the British offensive in Palestine. The British had to move their troops back to Europe and they suffered a major defeat.

The war ended with the Peace of Versailles, its conditions were worked out at a peace conference, where representatives of the World Zionist Organization and some influential Jewish groups took part. By that time, already, in the so-called "Balfour Declaration", England had given the obligation to create a Jewish "national hearth" in Palestine. This "Declaration" was formally just a letter from the then British Foreign Secretary Balfour to Lord Rothschild. (And the concept of "national hearth" is very

vague.) But later it was considered as the main document that later led to the creation of the State of Israel.

The most painful peace negotiations were for Germany, for her these were not negotiations dictated to her terms. The head of the German delegation was Brockdorff-Rantzau, a German and even a count (before that, the ambassador to Denmark, through him the financing of the Bolsheviks was carried out). But the head of the economic delegation was Melchior the Jew, before the head of the economic mission in occupied Ukraine. The economic delegation also included Warburg, Nathan, Wasserman, Solomonson.

The fate of the reconstituted Poland was decided at the peace conference. Under pressure from influential Jewish groups (mainly American), the main victorious countries insisted on Poland's acceptance of the commitments desirable for Polish Jewry. The Polish delegation objected to such obligations, assuming that they would follow from the general guarantees to all citizens that would be given in the constitution of the new Poland. But the victorious countries insisted on specific guarantees, using as a lever of influence the delay in resolving the issue of Poland's western borders. Sometimes it was about national minorities in general, but the participants clearly identified the Jews. Balfour sent a letter (June 25, 1919) to the Polish Prime Minister Paderewski, which had the character of a warning, referring to the public opinion of England and the Empire (especially Canada). The final text of the declaration on the creation of the Polish state included a statement on the protection of the rights of Jews. However, Jewish organizations (mainly American) demanded an investigation of the real situation of Jews in Poland, in particular, rumors of pogroms. Gibson, the US ambassador to Poland, argued that these were minor local incidents. Secretary of State Lansing also felt that their importance was greatly exaggerated by the American press. He arranged for Gibson to meet with representatives of American Jewish organizations, Brandes and Frankfurter. They threatened Gibson that the Senate would no longer approve him as ambassador. The Senate, however, approved it, but Lansing instructed him to no longer publish his reports on the situation of Jews in Poland. In connection with these events, a commission headed by a close associate of President Wilson and a prominent representative of American Jewry G. Morgenthau (former ambassador to Turkey) was sent to Poland from America. At the same time, Ser Stuart Samuel, brother of the influential politician Ser Herbert Samuel (whom Weizmann was once referred to as a "Jew in the government"), was sent from England on a similar mission.

In 1920, in connection with the war with Soviet Russia, Polish newspapers wrote that when the Red Army advanced, the Jewish population solemnly greeted it, and the retreating Polish units fired at. Such sentiments led to the order of the Ministry of War of August 6, 1920, which ordered the withdrawal of Jewish soldiers from military units, so that they did not make up more than 2% of them, and unite them into auxiliary construction units.

In post-war Europe, Germany was the "sick part". The tension of the war and the harsh conditions of the Treaty of Versailles led to a sharp drop in living standards. By almost

all indicators, production from 1913 to 1919 fell by about half: mining of coal, iron ore, production of cast iron, steel, etc. And by 1923, production had fallen by more than half. The incidence of tuberculosis has increased 2.5 times. Inflation, which soon led to a complete depreciation of the mark (more than 1000 times in 1921-22), an increase in unemployment - all this created the basis for revolutionary impulses. The beginning was the "November revolution" of 1918, when the monarchy was abolished. It was not the result of a direct revolutionary seizure of power, but pressure from the Entente, strikes, and individual unrest in the army.

Power was in the hands of the Social Democrats (November 9, 1918). As we have said (Chapter 9), the Jewish influence in the German Social Democracy was very strong. Now this is reflected in the general German situation. During the first days, power was in the hands of two "delegates" (meaning workers' delegates) Ebert and Haase. (Recall that in Chapter 9, the name Haase was found in the list of deputies of the Reichstag from the Social Democratic Party, who at the same time belonged to the Jewish faith.) of 6 people: Ebert, responsible for internal affairs and military affairs; Haase for foreign affairs; Scheidemann for finance; Dietman for demobilization; Landsberg for press and information; Bart for Social Policy. (Landsberg had already met in Chapter 9 among influential Jewish Social Democrats.) Ebert and Haase were equal co-chairs. Ministers and secretaries of state were subordinate to this group, among whom few changes were made. It was introduced only to become Secretary of the Treasury Schiffer and the new Minister of Food Wurm (we met him in Chapter 9), and also replaced the Minister of Economy. Later, becoming secretary Hugo Price (the son of a Jewish merchant) was introduced with the express purpose of preparing a new constitution. Two candidates were considered for this place, Price and Max Weber, but the choice was with Price. He became the main drafter of the constitution, in which he sought to replace the traditional division of Germany into "lands" by division into departments on the French model. Only strong resistance (in particular,

After the adoption of the constitution, Ebert was elected chairman and a government was formed headed by Scheidemann, in which Schiffer was Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Price Minister of the Interior, Landsberg Minister of Justice.

But, by analogy with Russia, it can be assumed that no less role than the government was played by the "Central Council of the German Socialist Republic" elected by the All-German Congress of Soviets, of which Cohen (Reis) was its chairman.

From the moment of the November revolution, the left wing of the Social Democracy immediately began to develop vigorously. On November 11, 1918, the "Spartan Union" was created, headed by K. Liebknecht, R. Luxemburg, L. Jogishes, P. Levy but also some Germans, for example, F. Mehring and V. Pik. On December 29, this union was transformed into the Communist Party of Germany. The "Spartak" movement also existed before the official creation of the "Union" (there was a "Spartak group" back in 1916). The Spartak movement enjoyed support from Russia, which was one of the reasons for the severance of Soviet-German diplomatic relations and the expulsion of

the Soviet ambassador Ioffe. Karl Radek was present at the organizational congress of the KKE. He expressed the hope that the International Council of Workers' Deputies will soon meet in Berlin and "

In the first days of 1919, the Spartacists tried to seize power in Berlin, but were defeated by the troops that remained loyal to the government, and K. Liebknecht, R. Luxemburg and L. Jogiches were killed. After that, P. Levi became the head of the KKE.

On January 10, 1919, the Bremen Soviet Republic was proclaimed and held out for about a month.

Shortly after the suppression of attempts to seize power in Berlin and Bremen, a crisis erupted in Munich. The military collapse of Germany led to the seizure of power by soldiers and workers. For some time, Kurt Eisner (the son of a Jewish merchant) was at the head of the government. His closest collaborators were Jaffe and Landauer. Formally, power belonged to the Landtag, where the majority were bourgeois parties. But then rather dark events unfolded. Eisner was killed by Count Arco and at the same time the Landtag was defeated (apparently prepared in advance). In February 1919, the Bavarian Soviet Republic was proclaimed. Lenin addressed her, outlining, in the form of questions, a clear program of action: "What measures did you take against the bourgeois executioners of Scheidemann and Co.? Did you arm the workers and disarm the bourgeoisie? Did you take hostages from among the bourgeoisie?" It was the Bavarian Republic that remained in the memories of many Germans as an example of the greatest leading participation of Jews in the revolution. The government that fled from Munich to Bamberg declared: "The Russian terror unleashed by alien elements is raging in Munich." The main figures were the liberal socialists Landauer and Muzam (who abandoned Judaism in his youth) and the communists: Levin, Levine, Toller, Axelrod. Axelrod recently arrived from Moscow as ROSTA's correspondent. It seems that the only German among those who played the first roles there was the sailor Egelhofer. The main figures were the liberal socialists Landauer and Muzam (who abandoned Judaism in his youth) and the communists: Levin, Levine, Toller, Axelrod. Axelrod recently arrived from Moscow as ROSTA's correspondent. It seems that the only German among those who played the first roles there was the sailor Egelhofer. The main figures were the liberal socialists Landauer and Muzam (who abandoned Judaism in his youth) and the communists: Levin, Levine, Toller, Axelrod. Axelrod recently arrived from Moscow as ROSTA's correspondent. It seems that the only German among those who played the first roles there was the sailor Egelhofer.

The attempted communist revolution in Munich was suppressed by the troops, as in Berlin.

By the tenth anniversary of these revolutionary battles, in 1929, the book "Illustrated History of the November German Revolution" was published in Berlin, published by a clearly leftist, perhaps communist, publishing house. The book is very interesting: in addition to describing these exciting events there, in the photographs, you can see the

revolutionary crowd, the faces of their leaders. But several figures were awarded with special, large portraits, in a whole page. Who are they?

Karl Marx, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Leo Jogisches, Eugen Levine.

Such, apparently, was the face of the revolutionary movement in Germany at that time.

The spirit of the revolutionary movement in Germany at that time was reflected by the congress of the Independent (ie, more radical) Social Democratic Party in October 1920. The then head of the Comintern, Zinoviev, delivered a speech that lasted several hours. He attacked the "right-wing" Social Democrats and predicted that "a large united communist party will now emerge in Germany and this will be the greatest event of our time." The objectionable Hilferding and Martov, who protested against the "dictatorship of Moscow," received much less support from the delegates. At the congress, a majority of the delegates spoke in favor of merging with the Communist Party. The "United Communist Party of Germany" was formed, which included half of the members of the "independent" Social-Democratic Party. Party and which became a section of the Comintern. Paul Levi (from the communists) and Ernst Deimig (from the "independents") became equal leaders of the new party. This description is taken from a book by a post-war (after World War II) German historian who is extremely cautious about Jewish influence. But it also shows that when the fate of the influential German party was being decided, the voices of people were heard, of which only Deimig had a German (not Jewish) surname.

We meet the same surge of Jewish names in Germany in different areas. So, in Prussia, Hirsch was at the head of the government and the ministry of the interior, in Saxony, Gradnauer (formerly an employee of the Parvus-Shklyarz firm) was prime minister, and Reinecke-Bloch in Mecklenburg. Even such a strictly progressive (later) author as Thomas Mann wrote in his diary in 1919:

*We are talking about the type of Russian Jew, the leader of the world movement, this explosive mixture of Jewish intellectual radicalism and Slavic-Christian dreams. The world, which still possesses the instinct of self-preservation, must, with all the tension of energy, as according to the laws of wartime, rise to fight this human type.*

And Churchill wrote then:

*This current among the Jews did not arise now. From the time of Spartak-Weishaupt (the fact that Churchill also enlisted Weishaupt as a Jew underscores how shocked many were then by the sudden Jewish influence in the revolutionary parties) and up to Karl Marx, further to Trotsky (Russia), Bella Kuhn (Hungary), Rosa Luxemburg (Germany) and Emma Goldman (United States) (...) Now this gang of crooks from the underground of Europe and America grabbed the Russian people by the collar and became the indisputable ruler of a huge country.*

In 1920, the military attempted to overthrow the Social Democratic government (Kapp's putsch). It was also suppressed, but as a reaction to it a "Red Army of the Ruhr" of about 100,000 people emerged, which established control over most of the Ruhr area and lasted for about 20 days. Already at the end of this era of revolutions and coups, there is an attempt to seize power in Munich, in which Hitler participated (1923). In the same year, France and Belgium occupied the Rhineland. The clashes that arose there, monstrous inflation, separatism brought Germany again (as in 1918-1919) to the brink of civil war. Communist and National Socialist armed groups emerged. In this tense situation, neither side was ready to abandon the appeal to anti-Jewish sentiments, apparently, widespread. For example, a representative of the extreme left in social democracy, Ruth Fischer (herself a Jew), said:

*Whoever calls for the fight against Jewish capital is already a fighter on the class front, even if he himself does not understand this, Overthrow the Jewish capitalists, to their lantern! But haven't you forgotten about Stinnes and Kleckner?*

In 1925, articles by Trotsky, Zinoviev, Stalin and Bukharin appeared in the communist newspaper Rote Fane, which were related to the "revolutionary situation" in Germany. In particular, Stalin wrote

*The communist revolution in Germany is now the greatest event in the world. The victory of the revolution in Germany will be of greater importance to the proletariat of Europe and America. What did the victory of the Russian revolution have? The victory of the German proletariat will undoubtedly shift the center of gravity of the world revolution from Moscow to Berlin.*

Looking back at the failed German communist revolution, we can compare it as a "variant" with our revolution. And, in particular, to establish that the participation of Jews there was no less than we did in Russia. And if the revolution did not win, then it certainly was not because little Jewish forces were invested in it. Now forgotten, often - killed by their own communists, Arkady Maslov, Ruth Fischer, Werner Scholem, Arthur Rosenberg, Heinz Neumann, Iven Katz and many others - then were among the leading leaders of the revolution, and if the circumstances were favorable for it, judging by analogy with Russia, they would faithfully serve her. All this makes us think once again about the view that in Russia the Jews rushed to the revolution, since under the previous regime they were oppressed. After all, Germany was then considered an example of the ideal,

In the same 1920s, the mysterious political career ended, and the life of Walter Rathenau itself. Even during the war, in 1918, when K. Radek was arrested in Germany, accused of preparing the revolution, Rathenau visited him several times in his cell and had numerous conversations with him. Radek talks about this fact, but, unfortunately, does not mention the content of the conversations. Rathenau was also interested in the short-lived Soviet Republic in Munich, as a step in the right direction - building a centralized and controlled economy. Now he enters the government, first as

minister of reconstruction, and in 1922 as minister of foreign affairs. But he supported the so-called "real policy" of Germany paying monstrous reparations that stretched out over several decades (for example, in a speech at the congress of the German Democratic Party, November 12-14, 1921). For the right, he turned out to be the ideal figure of the "Jewish plutocrat selling Germany." As a result, in 1922 he was assassinated by a terrorist suspected of being from the consul, a secret nationalist organization.

Of course, the concentration of such a great power in the hands of the Jews, and even at such a painful moment for Germany, had a strong impact on his entire life. For example, when Hirsch was the Prime Minister of Prussia, several hundred thousand Jews who had migrated from Poland, Galicia and the eastern regions that had ceded to Poland were admitted there. This was at a time when all of Germany was starving, many Germans were left homeless and homeless.

In a few years, Jews have taken a much higher position in economic and cultural life. In 1921, a brochure "Jewish Influence in Germany" was published, compiled, according to the author, according to official statistics and press data. The author cites very striking figures. For example, here are some data on occupational distribution. For every 1000 people there are:

	<b>among the Germans</b>	<b>among Jews</b>
agricultural workers	111	1.1
Manufacturers	32	52
Workers	138	34
Business owners	9.7	133

Here is a description of the living conditions:

<b>Number of rooms in the apartment</b>	<b>% in the whole population</b>	<b>% among Jews</b>
1	8.7	4.0
2	37.7	11.5
3-4	38.8	25.5
5-7	12.6	50.4
<b>more than 8</b>	2.2	9.1

The percentage of Jewish and German directors and board members cited by Sombart for the turn of the century (see Chapter 7) has doubled. Among lawyers, Jews accounted for 43%, among high officials of justice 78.7%, there were doctors in Munich: out of 1098 - 644 Jews, in Hamburg: out of 734 - 412, in Königsberg: out of 284 - 159.

By the beginning of the war, there were 937 Jewish high school teachers, while, as if their number were proportional to their share in the population, there would have been 31. There were students per 100,000 men:

	<b>among the Germans</b>	<b>among Jews</b>
1915 g.	74	556
1916 g.	81	587
1917 g.	111	662

Per 100,000 children attend:

	<b>Germans</b>	<b>Jews</b>
folk (lower) school	92.7	41.9
high school	4.6	25.2

According to the author's calculations, 5% of all newspapers were completely in German hands, 35% under Jewish leadership, 60% under Jewish influence (staff, announcements). Of the 806 members of the German Publishers Union, i.e. of the most influential publishers in Germany, there were 365 Jews. Of the 3241 journals published in 1921, 1154 were published by Jews.

Among the leadership of the Social Democratic Party (more moderate), Jews accounted for 18%. "Independent" (breakaway, more radical) 65%, communists 87%. When, for example, in the order of demilitarization, a commission of observers over the Ministry of War was set up, there were 7 Jews out of 8 members: Goldschmidt, Kizwant, Leve, Schlesinger, Varshinsky, Tsuket, Brunn and Riepenbaum.

In a strange way, such a dramatically increased influence of Jews on life went hand in hand with the spread of nationalist sentiments, a sense of alienation among Jews. It was especially vividly expressed in the book of the famous Jewish national figure Yakov Klatskin "The Problem of Modern Jewry", which was published in Germany in the late 1920s (the 3rd edition of 1930 was available to me). Even later, the author stated the same thoughts in a brochure that appeared with a laudatory foreword by Einstein. Isolation from other peoples in this the author sees the goal of all Jewry. The method is to strengthen the "spiritual ghetto, portable walls of the Jewish state", "tents



of Israel" ie. education (on a religious basis) of the psychology of alienation, non-merger with other peoples.

*Our sages said: For other peoples of the world, exile is not dispersion (galut). But for Israel, who does not eat their bread or drink their wine, exile is truly a Galut. A strong wall, created by us, separated us from the people of the country, and behind the wall lived a Jewish state in miniature. So, in his opinion, it should remain.*

*We are strangers everywhere among the indigenous nations, and we want to adhere to our alienation.*

*Can we call the countries of our scattering fatherland, dreaming and striving for liberation from exile? What an amazing, amazingly beloved fatherland, which we call Galut (scattering) and from which we strive to escape!*

*This is a "land of strangers", "a violent fatherland."*

*We must always repeat: an insurmountable chasm gapes between you and us, your spirit, your myths and legends, your national heritage, your customs and habits, your national and religious shrines are alien to us.*

*The days of your national memory, the joys and sorrows of your national life, the history of your victories and defeats, your hymns and battle songs, your national aspirations and hopes are alien to us. Your national borders do not divide our people, and your border disputes are not ours. Above them, our unity extends despite all the connections and divisions of your patriotism.*

*The Jews, who died heroically, fighting in the troops of the people around them, cultural workers, all this, the author declares, are traitors to the Jewish national cause, who wasted their talents and lives. He cites ancestors as an example: The Talmudic policy of our fathers knew no other patriotism than Jewish. They were saddened by the victories of their host people if they brought misfortune to the peoples of another country. Their sympathy for peoples and countries was subordinated exclusively to the interests of the Jews. They often belonged not to their country of residence, but to the country of residence of their fellow tribesmen, if the position of the Jews in this country was better.*

*This is not even a sermon on passive detachment, but a call to battle. First of all, against Christianity:*

*Where is the voice of Jewry being heard now against the greatest lie of history? Does Jewry dare to throw a cry to mankind: Crush the reptile!*

He urges:

*To demand from your oppressor the recognition of inner powerlessness, in short, **spiritual surrender** to Judaism.*

*But he perceives all his life as a war:*

*Our galut existence is, in a sense, a state of permanent war.*

*This is a state of unrelenting battle with the alien world around us, which seeks to consume us.*

One must imagine the position of Germany at that time. Defeat, national humiliation, hunger, unemployment, illness (% of patients with tuberculosis, for example, or infant mortality were several times higher than in France). For many Germans in these conditions, the memories of the "heroic war", when they fought with the whole world, remained the only consolation. (We do not undertake here to discuss whether it was "right" or not.) But at the same time there was an influential movement of "anti-militarism", for example, the "New Fatherland" union, later renamed the "Human Rights League", whose leadership included Einstein, Bernstein, publisher of the magazine "Weltbuehne" Jacobson, journalist Tucholsky, Kurt Eisner, Heinrich Mann, Kate Kollwitz, close associate of Rathenau-Max Dessuar and others, calling on every German in his soul to realize the guilt of the Germans before France. Such a trend could very easily acquire an anti-German connotation (for example, when the Veltbühne magazine accused the government of secretly rearming the army, violating the Treaty of Versailles). But often there was also a direct desire, under the guise of anti-militarism in the spirit of Heine and Berne, to mock the "stupid Germans". For example, the Berliner Tageblatt founded by Mosse (we have already met this newspaper more than once) in the Ulk supplement systematically published feuilletons by the editor Tucholsky (an extreme liberal who declared that he was "coming out" of Judaism), under the pseudonym Theodore Tiger, in which the officers were ridiculed and spat upon up to the call: "to rip off their shoulder straps!" It got to the point that the Minister of War, Social Democrat Noske was forced to go to court. But the organ of the Social Democratic Party Forverts (editor Kuttner) supported not its party comrade, but Tucholsky.

The journal published in Israel in Russian contains reflections of the famous Israeli philosopher Shmuel Bergman:

*Our role in the diaspora is that of parasites. Let's take those Jews who lived and worked in Germany on the eve of World War I and shortly after it. It is possible that they even undoubtedly had some kind of stimulating role in German culture. But if we talk about the self-expression of the nation, the Jewish nation, about its contribution to world culture, then the overall result of their activities, it seems to me, was sharply negative. The same can apparently be said about our role in America today, although here I am not an expert.*

*It is difficult to explain all this to a person who did not live in that era. There were magazines such as "Tagebuch" by Schwarzschild, "Weltbühne" by Z. Jakobson, from the pages of which Jews regularly, like an injection, injected nihilism and irritation into the blood of the German people. Oh yes, the Jews were able to notice a lot and, due to their irresponsibility, they could afford to ridicule any negative aspects of German life, the German officers, the bourgeoisie, the domestic order, could flaunt their repulsive features. It all started a long time ago, since the time of Heine.*

*Avenarius (editor of the Kunstworth magazine, who played a large role in Kafka's development as a writer) once wrote: "Jews are the administrators of German literature." And it was true ... Moreover, if we talk about the then German or Czech Jews, their "role" inspired them with a sense of superiority, arrogance in relation to the surrounding people. Meanwhile, this feeling was absolutely*

*groundless, because they actually existed thanks to the physical and spiritual activities of this people. It is curious that in Germany at that time a purely German literature also developed, which the Jews did not read at all: this literature told about the life of the peasants, which the Jews were not at all interested in. Thus, there were, as it were, two German literatures, one that interested the Jews and one that they ignored.*

The author comes to a very harsh conclusion:

*... in general, the contribution of the Jews had a nihilistic influence (as it seems to me, in today's American literature) and there was something subtly parasitic about it.*

And, indeed, it begins with Heine, who wrote, for example:

*The big donkey that was my father,  
He was from the German land;  
Donkey-German milk  
Our mother nursed us.*

...

The Germans were taught that they are a herd of donkeys, dangerous for their neighbors, since, by their stupidity, they are able to trample normal people. And this spilled out on the most talented of the Western European peoples, a warlike and strong-minded people, proud to the point of self-aggrandizement. It is now clear, and it was easy to foresee even then, that this line of behavior could have only two outcomes: either the Germans would be completely broken, or they would be pushed into a desperate, insane attempt to resist. The second outcome was realized and it was, it seems to me, although not the only one, but one of the essential factors that gave rise to German National Socialism.

These feelings were superimposed on continuous financial scandals, again with a preponderance of Jewish names. Thus, the case of the speculator Julius Barmat, considered in 1925, thundered throughout Germany and his name became a household name. For example, Radek published a brochure "Barmatov's Social Democracy", where he wrote about "Polish-Jewish-Dutch-German speculators" who, in his words, were especially closely associated with social democracy, while Stresemann relied on the concern " Russian Jew Litvin ".

Of course, not only Germany, but also other countries, defeated in World War I, suffered a particularly difficult time of devastation and uprising in the post-war years. Thus, in Hungary, which was born from the fragments of Austria-Hungary, the Hungarian Soviet Republic arose in 1919. The striking (disproportionately with the entire population) participation of Jews in its leadership was noted more than once. So, O. I. Levin writes:

*According to the well-known Hungarian sociologist Oskar Yassi, himself a Jew by origin (if I am not mistaken, he did not formally abandon Judaism), who served as minister of national minorities in the first revolutionary, pre-Bolshevik government, the so-called Karolya period, corresponding to the period of the Provisional Government in our country, the number of Jewish leaders of the Bolshevik movement reached 95%. In order to avoid misunderstandings, it should be added that Yassi is by no means a "Black Hundred". He belongs to a very radical group, all his life he fought for universal suffrage, agrarian reform, demanding the abolition of large land tenure, equality of nationalities and the establishment of a democratic system, and now, under the reactionary government of Horthy, he is forced to live in exile.*

For more information, see Sombart's book cited above. He refers to the seminar work of his student, written on the basis of Hungarian materials of the time. Sombart writes:

*In Hungary in 1919, all the main leaders were Jews: Bella Kun, Pogany, Samuelli, Corvin-Klein, Kunfi, Lukacs. Of the 33 people's commissars who were members of the ruling council, 24 were Jews; 9 non-Jews occupied less influential positions (commissioners for the Ukrainian or German minority, etc.).*

The following is ancillary data, from which we borrow only a few typical examples:

*People's Commissariat for Military Affairs: out of 7 people's commissars, 6 are Jews, out of 52 heads of sections - 39 are Jews. People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs: both commissars and their deputies are Jews. People's Commissariat of Finance: all three commissioners and all their deputies are Jews. People's Commissariat of Education: all 5 commissars are Jews, out of 27 heads of sections 21 are Jews. People's Commissariat of Agriculture: 1 Jewish commissar (doctor) and 2 Christians (shepherd and mason). Council of National Economy: 4 Jewish commissars and 2 Christians (workers).*

Weizmann writes that even before World War I, there were 4 Jews in the Italian cabinet of ministers: Luzatti (prime minister), Ottolenghi, Sopino and Titoni. The measure of Rome was also a Jew. In 1922, he negotiated with the Italian Foreign Minister, Signor Schanzer, "possibly of Jewish origin" (while Luzatti was prime minister). Here is a particularly dramatic example from the life of post-war Italy, which is described by R. Michels.

In 1920, a critical situation arose, reminiscent of the pre-revolutionary one. The workers occupied the factories and sometimes occupied them for a month; workers' armed detachments were formed. Then the government managed to organize a meeting of entrepreneurs and workers at the national level and the crisis was averted. Who met whom? The entrepreneurs were represented by the General Secretary of the Union of Entrepreneurs Olivetti, a Jew, and the workers were Terracino from Turin and Bruno Levi from Genoa, both Jews. And this is in Italy, in which then there were 50 thousand Jews per 39.5 million population!

## 2. Towards the second war.

In England, in the development of a tradition that began with D. Israeli, Jews occupied high government posts. For example, Joseph Isaac's son, Viscount, Baron, Lord, Marquis of Reading, was Chief Justice, Viceroy of India and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Herbert Samuel was not only the head of the Liberal Party, but also the High Commissioner in Palestine, which after the war was turned into a "Mandatory England". He held this post from 1920-25. Back in 1914, when Weizmann was trying to establish contacts with the British government about the resettlement of Jews to Palestine, he was told: "You have a Jew in the government" and pointed to Herbert Samuel. Its senior secretary in Palestine was Brigadier General Deeds, who, upon retirement, led the Anglo-Palestinian Association in England. During Samuel's reign in Palestine, its Jewish population doubled. Herbert Samuel's brother Stewart, as mentioned above, was sent to Poland to make sure that Jews were not being oppressed there.

As early as 1920, violent clashes between Jewish settlers and Palestinians began. Then a detachment organized by Zhabotinsky took part in them, which was sentenced for this to 15 years in prison. Soon Samuel pardoned Jabotinsky, but he rejected the amnesty, as it extended to the convicted Arabs. Then his sentence was revised and canceled. It is interesting that, speaking of these clashes, Weizmann does not hesitate to call them a "pogrom", just like the clashes in 1929. He speaks of the "Jerusalem pogrom." And with regard to Russia, he speaks of "thousands of victims of pogroms" while in the largest clashes the number of victims was several dozen. That is, Weizmann actually proposes to consider the "pogroms" in Russia in 1902-1906.

A dramatic story, the hero of which was a very famous person, happened in the United States. We are talking about Henry Ford, one of the largest industrial figures in the United States of the early XX century. He was a man of broad interests and impulses, tried to achieve peace during World War I, and had his own economic ideas. He preached the idea of "class cooperation" under capitalism, "people's capitalism". Actually, his success in the production of cars named after him is a reflection of the same ideas. Its principle was to manufacture (and sell) a large number of cars at affordable prices, "so that every farmer could have his own car." And the workers in his factories received higher wages (or so he claimed) and enjoyed a number of social benefits. One aspect of his multifaceted activity was the purchase of a newspaper in his hometown of Dearborn, near Detroit, where his factories were concentrated. In this newspaper "The Independent from Dearborn" (perhaps there is a certain pun in the title), various issues of modern public life, especially in the United States, were discussed. there were published a number of articles on the influence of Jews on various aspects of US life. Later he published a book on this topic: "World Jewry" (which he characterized as "a study of the Jewish question") and a large collection of materials "Jewish Activity in America". there is a certain pun in the title) discussed various issues of modern public life, especially in the United States. there were published a number of articles on the influence of Jews on various aspects of US life. Later he published a book on this topic: "World Jewry" (which he characterized as

"a study of the Jewish question") and a large collection of materials "Jewish Activity in America". there is a certain pun in the title) discussed various issues of modern public life, especially in the United States. there were published a number of articles on the influence of Jews on various aspects of US life. Later he published a book on this topic: "World Jewry" (which he characterized as "a study of the Jewish question") and a large collection of materials "Jewish Activity in America".

He formulated the following statement:

*We are fighting not with people, but with principles, false principles that drain the moral vitality of the people. These principles come from a source that is easy to discover and disseminated in a way that is easy to point out. They can be stopped by opening them. When people recognize the nature and source of the influences that capture them, that will be enough.*

Ford wrote, for example:

*Objection to the Jews acting as a whole, it is said that Mr. Kaan is one of the most influential conservatives. Rosa Pastor Stokes and Maurice Hilquist are radicals, the conservative union leader is Samuel Gompers, and ere the most influential radical rival is Sydney Hillman. As for the "liberal center", it, with its Brandes, McKeys, Felix Frankfurters, gives the same picture. But this simply means that all shades of American public life are influenced by Jews!*

He also talks about his personal experience:

*From the moment these writings of mine appeared in print, they were under an organized ban. The post office, telegraph, and verbal preaching all acted in the same direction: every one of my articles was shouted as bullying. At first glance, it might seem that they really are an attack on a helpless and pitiable people, until finally it became clear that the cry for help was marked with the seal of those in power. The funds of those who protested and the number of members of the unions, the chairman of which excitedly demanded my renunciation of everything that appeared in the press, clearly indicated this. At the heart of all this hype is the idea of a boycott; this threat has been the reason that all attempts to publicize the exposure of the most innocent content on the Jewish question have so far failed in America.*

The same fate awaited Ford himself. In 1927, he was forced to renounce his views (in a letter to the leader of American Jewry, Marshal) and even publicly burn his book.

The works published by Ford are often naive and not very convincing, for example, he attaches great importance to the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" and in general to the idea of a conspiracy. This is not surprising. Ford believes that Jewish influence in the United States began to manifest itself during the Civil War, that is, approximately from the time he was born. In such a short time, society is unable to grasp the complexity of

the situation it has faced: the authors reflect only a vague sense of anxiety and are ready to be content with relatively superficial explanations. But the fate of Ford himself is incomparably brighter: what kind of force was needed to break the might of his industrial empire?

After the end of World War I, many anti-liberal movements arose throughout the world, opposing the concept of a parliamentary-democratic state with the idea of a national and corporate state. After the fascist movement came to power in Italy in 1922, they all began to be called fascists. They came to power in a number of countries: Italy, Hungary, Romania, Austria, Germany, Spain, Portugal. But of these, only the current of German National Socialism was the real force capable of establishing itself on a global scale. Although it borrowed a lot and had a lot in common with other fascist currents, in my opinion it is a completely unique phenomenon that can only be understood from the peculiarities of German ideology and the situation in Germany after World War I. The emergence of this new historical force has sparked fears of both Western democracies (France, England, USA) and the USSR. An attempt was made to unite their efforts in the fight against the expanding fascist influence, while the failed attempt was realized for some time in 1941-45. It was within the framework of such a policy that in 1934 the USSR joined the League of Nations and constantly promoted "the policy of international security" there.

At this time, Nachum Goldman took part in the work of the League of Nations (although it is difficult to understand which state he represented then). He recalls this era:

*Before the war, most Soviet diplomats were Jews.*

And more specifically:

*Once Litvinov appeared in Geneva with 14 delegates, of whom 11 were Jews. I asked the minister - why do you need this synagogue? (another, unknown to me, Jewish term is used, meaning the Jewish religious community).*

Litvinov replied that the Jews know foreign languages (but did the surviving Russian intellectuals know them too?).

But the case was not an isolated one, for example, when the civil war in Spain began, the support of the republican, anti-Francoist camp from the USSR was directed almost exclusively by leaders of Jewish origin. The head of military intelligence at that time was S.P. Uritsky, the main military adviser was General Stern (under the nickname Kleber), especially in aviation, General Smushkevich. Slutsky (under the pseudonym Marcos) directed the purges, in particular the destruction of the POUM (Communist Party of Catalonia). Rosenberg was the USSR ambassador to Spain, and Orlov (Feldbin) was the resident. The commander of the 12th International Brigade was Mate Zalka (Frankl), who worked under the name of Lukach, and the largest propagandists were Ehrenburg and Koltsov (Fridland).

In 1935, at the 7th Congress of the Comintern, the policy of the "Popular Front" was proclaimed, which required a refusal to view non-communist Social Democrats as "social fascists" and the main enemy. The "Popular Front" won the elections in France in 1936. The nominated prime minister was Leon Blum, the same one mentioned (see Chapter 9) due to his weakness to put in leading posts in the party he leads mainly his fellow tribesmen ( although Berdyaev, in an article written after World War II, calls him "one of the most honest, idealistic and cultural figures in France"). However, the policy of the "Popular Front" was not successful, its government in France did not last even 2 years.

The position of Jews in Germany began to change for the worse in connection with Hitler's coming to power, as the anti-Jewish concept played a major role in his ideology. Shortly after he came to power, the American Jewish Congress organized a boycott of German goods, and the World Jewish Congress called for resistance to Germany by all means, so that American newspapers wrote: "Judea has declared war on Germany." In Germany, the well-known Nuremberg Laws were adopted, which barred Jews (with some exceptions) from access to a number of professions: officers, professors in higher education, doctors, etc. This caused widespread emigration, mainly among the Jewish intelligentsia. However, the situation, apparently, has not yet acquired a dramatic character. A German historian, already our contemporary and therefore extremely cautious in such situations, writes:

*After the Nuremberg Laws, German Jews had several relatively calm years. Their migration was encouraged and the large number of those who remained created a remarkably viable and varied way of life (...). In the economy, the position of the Jews has hardly changed, and in the laws concerning economic life, there were often signatures of Jewish bankers next to the signature of Adolf Hitler.*

The turning point occurred in connection with the so-called "crystal night". The reason for this was the murder in 1938 by the Polish Jew Grinshpan of the 3rd Secretary of the German Embassy in Paris von Rath. However, this was not the first time. Thus, in 1936 the head of a Nazi foreign organization in Switzerland was assassinated by David Frankfurter. The situation was reminiscent of the current situation in the United States after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001: the state had to find a response to the terrorist act directed against its citizens. Hitlerite Germany responded with Kristallnacht. A large number of shops were destroyed, and several synagogues were burned. Jews were beaten, several dozen people were killed. Tens of thousands were detained, in most cases released with the obligation to leave Germany. Moreover, after 2 years, addressing the Reichstag on January 30, 1939, Hitler said that if Jewish finance capital unleashed a world war, the result would be "the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe." Since the war began and Hitler more than once accused the Jewish financial capital of being a "warmonger", many see in this phrase of Hitler an indication of the plan he already had at that time for "the final solution of the Jewish question", which boiled down to the physical destruction of the Jewish population of Europe.



In 1939, a war broke out between Germany and the alliance of England, France and Poland, in 1941 the USSR, the USA and Japan were drawn into it. The war has indeed become a world war.

During the war, there is the brutal persecution of Jews by the National Socialist regime. Of course, a very large number of Jews were exterminated. I am personally sure of this not so much from the available literary sources as from the stories I heard immediately after the end of the war. Residents of various places from the occupied territories of the USSR, who had no reason to suspect of exaggeration, said that the German authorities announced the registration of Jews, certain groups of them were deported, and then no one heard anything about them. After the war, this extermination of large masses of East European Jews was called the "Holocaust" (a difficult-to-translate term, apparently of ancient Greek origin, meaning roughly "sacrifice by burning"). The term "Catastrophe" is sometimes used. A whole literature is devoted to this. Moreover, it is not denied that other peoples at this time suffered a catastrophe, but then, in a significant way, this word is written with a small letter. This singling out of the suffering suffered by the Jews as a very special phenomenon somehow touches the moral feeling. After all, the losses of Poles, Serbs, Belarusians are hardly amenable to accurate counting and were a national catastrophe for these peoples. Although at first the number of Jewish deaths was usually called "approximate", then the number of 6 million was established and is most often called. Attempts by some researchers to challenge this figure met with fierce resistance. However, there are a number of arguments supporting this "heretical" point of view. From general considerations, it seems to me that it is clear that such a statement, emanating from the victors in war is always exaggerated many times over. For the first time after the end of the war, everyone in whose hands was power was interested in depicting as vividly as possible the atrocities of Nazi Germany against the Jews. First of all, the Jews themselves, who secured the position of "eternally unjustly persecuted", so that up to our time the most effective objection to trying to really assess their role "means you are of the same views as Hitler." Likewise, the communist government in the USSR, which could point to the innumerable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which it saved the world, in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years. For the first time after the end of the war, everyone in whose hands was power was interested in depicting as vividly as possible the atrocities of Nazi Germany against the Jews. First of all, the Jews themselves, who secured the position of "eternally

unjustly persecuted", so that up to our time the most effective objection to attempts to really assess their role is "it means that you are of the same views as Hitler." Likewise, the communist government in the USSR, which could point to the innumerable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which it saved the world, in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years. were interested in the most vivid depiction of the atrocities of Nazi Germany against the Jews. First of all, the Jews themselves, who secured the position of "eternally unjustly persecuted", so that up to our time the most effective objection to trying to really assess their role "means you are of the same views as Hitler." Likewise, the communist government in the USSR, which could point to the innumerable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which it saved the world, in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years. were interested in the most vivid depiction of the atrocities of Nazi Germany against the Jews. First of all, the Jews themselves, who secured the position of "eternally unjustly persecuted", so that up to our time the most effective objection to attempts to really assess their role is "it means that you are of the same views as Hitler." Likewise, the communist government in the USSR, which could point to the innumerable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which it saved the world, in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years. which consolidated the position of "eternally unjustly persecuted", so that up to our time the most effective objection to attempts to really assess their role is "it means that you are of the same views with Hitler." Likewise, the communist government in the USSR, which could point to the innumerable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which it saved the world, in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years. which consolidated the position of "eternally unjustly persecuted", so that up to our time the most effective objection to attempts to really assess their role is "it means that you are of the same views with Hitler." Likewise, the communist government in the USSR, which could point to the innumerable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which it saved the world, in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years. which could point to the incalculable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which she saved the world in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years. which could point to the incalculable atrocities of the Hitlerite regime, from which she saved the world in order to silence the protests against the establishment of this power in Eastern Europe. Finally, Western democracies, whose press was under the strongest Jewish influence. And no one would have dared to object in those years.

Therefore, accurate, numerical data on the Jewish "Catastrophe" can hardly inspire confidence, but a huge catastrophe undoubtedly befell the Jews then (like many peoples of Europe). Probably, the catastrophe of Eastern European Jewry was of the same scale as the medieval disasters of the Jews during the "Black Death" or the "Shepherd's" uprising. To be honest, I do not understand the position of those who dispute the "canonical" figure of 6 million Jews killed by the Nazis. Some of them deny the existence of gas chambers - but, strictly speaking, the better is a shot in the back of the head? Others dispute the very figure of 6 million, stressing that the losses of other peoples were often no less tragic than those of the Jews. Such a statement seems likely - for the reasons I have mentioned. But unless, if it turns out, that there were "only" 2 million killed, will this remove the acuteness of the problem? However, in any case, the courage of this small group, persecuted around the world, inspires respect. Obviously, not all of them are Germans trying to forget an unpleasant episode in their history, to prove that there was "an ordinary war". For example, one of the first was the Frenchman Rassinier, a member of the Resistance, who was sent to a German concentration camp for this. And they are fighting, in any case, for liberation from arbitrarily imposed prohibitions, for the freedom of scientific research and human thought in general. trying to forget an unpleasant episode in their history, to prove that there was "an ordinary war". For example, one of the first was the Frenchman Rassinier, a member of the Resistance, who was sent to a German concentration camp for this. And they are fighting, in any case, for liberation from arbitrarily imposed prohibitions, for the freedom of scientific research and human thought in general.

The tragedy that happened, of course, had an impact on the attitude of Jews with other peoples, an influence that will make itself felt for a long time to come.

It is difficult for us to imagine those painful and painful experiences that aroused in the Jewish soul the memories of the tragedy that broke out during the war. A hint of them comes through in a publication that appeared in the Jewish samizdat magazine "Jews in the CCCP". Although there seem to be quite a few issues of this magazine, some measures are being taken to ensure that it remains in a very limited circle of readers. In any case, the author managed to get acquainted with only two issues. In one of them, No. 15 (July-September 1977), a part of the translation (beginning in No. 9-13) of M. Elnins's work "Forged by Rage" is given. It tells about the Jewish organization DIN, created in 1945 in Western Europe, with the aim of revenge against the Germans for crimes against Jews. The organization had its own people in the military administration of all occupying powers, supplying the DIN with information, forged documents and military uniforms. The first action was directed against a secret organization of German teenagers who had hidden weapons in the forest, gathered at night in the forest with a banner around the fire. 140 teenagers were killed by machine guns and grenades. "... For what? You need to ask someone else about this .." The following is a description of

a number of such actions. "They took Schwartz with them and on the way left him with his throat cut ..." "They interrogated Wetzel for two days and then drowned him ..." and so on. "They quite openly drove up to the house of the person they wanted to catch, or walked to his place of work, or simply stopped him on the street. The group leader presented his identity card (a false identity obtained through his people in the occupation forces) and the person was informed, that he was summoned to headquarters for routine interrogation. More often than not, this was enough. If a person persisted, then they just beat him on the head and dragged him into the car. "The captured Germans were promised to save their lives if they betrayed other hiding Nazis, threatening that" if he lied, he would face a painful death. "" They killed him anyway, Of course, it was not according to the rules of croquet, but after all, they did not play. "" The method of murder depended on the circumstances, but most often it was strangulation. " only concrete, between person and person. But the years taught them a different truth, and the blood of 6 million Jews screamed about a different reality. "" Hundreds of thousands of Germans took a direct part in the extermination of European Jews; it was the work of a whole people, and therefore retribution had to be directly related to the extent of the evil done. "" So, they began to kill the Germans, not knowing what their specific fault was, but knowing only that these people brought death and torture to the Jewish people. " remember this as "the first hunting season". They tracked down and killed over a hundred people. None of those who fell into the hands of DIN left. "Once, having infiltrated in stolen military uniforms and with false documents in the camp where the interned SS officers were kept, they laid a mine under the barrack." Pieces of the inhabitants of the SS barrack rained down on the entire camp ". But in the end they felt that the effect of their activities was insufficient." What the Germans did to the Jews as Jews - these Jews from DIN will do to the Germans - they will not leave any German family unaffected.

Unfortunately, after that it reads: "continuation in the next issue", and this number is not available to the author. However, it is hardly necessary. A million Germans still, hopefully, were not killed, and the abyss of hatred and its victory over normal human feelings is visible anyway. And it's not about the actions of these unfortunate madmen, born of a nightmare that a rare soul can endure. But someone wrote a book about it with excuses, some of which we have quoted. And someone considered it necessary in 1977 to translate it and bring it to the attention of "Jews in the USSR".

The same feelings were manifested in the plans that were proposed for Germany during the war. So, in 1941, T. Kaufman's book "Germany must perish" appeared in the USA, which proposed a plan to sterilize the entire German people. Moreover, at this time, the United States had not yet fought with Germany. During the war, a close adviser to Roosevelt, Morgenthau Jr., developed a plan to dismember Germany, destroy any large production in it, including mines and mines, reduce the access of Germans to education, turn Germany into a mainly agricultural country supplying agricultural workers and others. countries, population decline and control of the occupation authorities over the press. This plan, apparently, met at first with the approval of Roosevelt and Churchill, but after the war it was not implemented. since the Germans were needed as allies in the outbreak of the Cold War. Nevertheless, Morgenthau

published his plan in a separate brochure (it is surprising how this plan coincides in detail with what is happening now with Russia).

To the same type of painful experiences, I include the many times made statements that many other peoples are to blame for the mass extermination of Jews by the Nazis, who did not accept the whole tragedy of what was happening. Or the concept that the "Holocaust" was a consequence of a long-standing "anti-Semitism" and "anti-Semitism" arose out of Christianity, which blames the Jews for the crucifixion of Christ. After all, the Poles did not assert that the entire mankind was to blame for their mass destruction by the Nazis, for the fact that Hitler announced "the end of the Polish state forever". Such feelings, whatever they may be caused, then begin to live their own lives.

After all, the people, when dealing with the Germans, cannot proceed from one worldview, and with Arabs or Russians - from another. The same reaction, perhaps only in a less vivid form, will be provoked by any "enemy" or even one who "stands across the road."

Later, the famous Jewish philosopher Martin Buber wrote on this subject:

*The worst influence of National Socialism is that it infected other peoples with its philosophy of violence. This victory of the "subhuman" (Untermenschliches) over the human did not affect any people as deeply as the Jewish. (...)  
We became aware of this misfortune when a group of armed Jews attacked an Arab village. It was our sin, the Jewish sin against the Spirit. Our faith in the Spirit turned out to be insufficient to resist the spread of this devilish, shameful teaching among our own people.*

## LITERATURE

Rathenau Walter. Impressionen. Leipzig. 1902.

Arnim Otto. Die Juden in Kriegsgesellschaften. Munchen. 1921.

Bosl - Franz - Hofman. Biographisches Worterbuch zur deutschen Geschichte. Munchen. 1974.

Korn D. Wer ist wer im Judentum. Munchen. 1996.

Winger S. Grosse Judische Nationalbiographie. Ceranti 1925 -1927.

Komei D. Who is who in the history of Jews. London - Moscow. 1974, 1995.

Hayek FA The Road to Serfdom. London. 1943.

Baruch B. American Industry in the War. N.-Y. 1941.

Baruch B. The Public Years. N.-Y. 1960.

Drabkin Ya.S. November revolution in Germany. M. 1967.

Lehman H. Die Weimarer Republik. Munchen. 1960.

Illustrierte Geschichte der Deutschen Revolution 1918 - 1928. Berlin. 1929.

Nolte Ernst. Der Europäische Burgerkrieg 1917 - 1945. Berlin. 1987.

Revolution und Räterepublik in Munchen 1918-1919 in  
Augenzeugenberichten. Dusseldorf. 1969.

Muller - Meiningen. Aus Bayerns schwersten Tagen. Berlin - Leipzig. 1924.

Funck Bernhard. Der Judische Einfluss in Deutschland. Munchen. 1921.

Klatzkin Jakob, Probleme des modernen Judentums. Berlin. 1930 (III Afl.).

Lungren - Nielsen K. The Polish Problem at the Paris peace Conference (especially The Jewish Problem section). Odensee. 1979.

Shmuel-Hugo Bergman. Israeli synthesis of humanism and religion. Magazine "22". Tel Aviv. 1978.

Levin O.I. In the collection "Russia and the Jews". Cit. in Ch. 1.

Sombart W. Der Proletarische Sozialismus. Cit. in Chapter 9.

Weizmann Ch. Trial and Error. Cit. in Chapter 10.

Michels Robert. Sozialismus und Faschismus als politische Stromungen in  
Italien. Munchen. 1925. Bd 2.

Reed D. The Zion Controversy. Cit. in Chapter 1.

Ford H. The International Jew. 1922 (reprinted 1948)

Goldmann N. Cit. in Chapter 3.

Reitlingen G. The Final Solution L. 1971.

Thion S. Verite historique ou verite politique. Le dossier de l'affaire  
Faurisson. Paris. 1971.

Jewish Resistance in Nazi-Occupied Europe. L. 1974.

Elnins M. Hardened by Rage. Journal "Jews in the USSR" (samizdat). NN 9-13, 15-126. 1977.

Kaufmann TA Germany Must Perish. N.-Y. 1941.

Morgenthau H. Germany is our problem. N.-Y. - L. 1945.

"The Russian Idea and the Jews". M. "Science". 1994.

Katz J. From Prejudice to Destruction. (Quoted in Ch. 4.)

Kohn.H. Martin Buber. Koln. 1965.

## Chapter 13. Under the communist system.

### 1. Building socialism in one country.

Now in our country the memory of the close connection between communism and Jewry is being carefully removed from the memory. But for a long time this was not hidden at all, it was even emphasized. For example:

*We cry a lot, we groan too much,  
But our people, the past fire, is pure.  
No wonder the word "Jew" is always synonymous  
with the holy, great word communist.*

(Can be found in any collection of poems by Margarita Aliger).

Although Russian grammar is lame here, the mood expresses a definite one: the equality "Bolshevik = Jew" was not considered "stupid" (as Gorky once wrote) in the Jewish environment. In Chapter 11, we cited lists of members of the Politburo, which give reason to talk about the leading role of Jewry in the party, and therefore in the whole country. But it is precisely in relation to this indicator, in the representation of Jews in the supreme power itself, that some further changes take place. At the XIV Congress, 1926, only 2 Jews find themselves in the Politburo (which consisted of 9 people): Trotsky and Zinoviev. And at the 15th Congress (1927) there was not a single Jew in the Politburo! It consisted of Bukharin, Voroshilov, Kalinin, Kuibyshev, Molotov, Rykov, Rudzutak, Stalin and Tomsy. Likewise, there were no Jews in the Politburo at the 16th Congress (1930). Then, however, upward went new Jews from among those who supported Stalin: Kaganovich, Mekhlis. But they never reached the same weight numerically as in the first post-revolutionary years. This process is associated with the struggle that took place within the party, with the emergence of oppositions that defended their own program at congresses.

And here a very important feature manifested itself: Jewry did not act as a single, coordinated force. Jewish forces were dispersed between the fighting factions (which, on the other hand, retained influence, no matter which faction won). It is quite obvious that if, after the death of Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Radek had acted in a united front, they would have subordinated the party to themselves. From the point of view of the theory of "Jewish power", the split between Trotsky and Zinoviev at the Thirteenth Congress was suicidal. This demonstrates the special character of the action of "Jewry" in our country, and therefore, probably, throughout history. This does not deny its existence, nor its significance for the destinies of other peoples. But the facts do not fit into the often expressed concept of a "worldwide conspiracy" led from a single center (for example, the "Elders of Zion").

We tend to imagine any "community" with some organic unity, by analogy with a person who forms his goals, finds ways to achieve them, whose organs are subordinated to these goals and impulses coming from the brain (and maybe from the soul). But, even if



we limit ourselves to biological analogies, we can point to examples of other, very viable organisms. For example, hydra has neither a brain nor a spinal cord and its nerve cells are located more or less evenly throughout the body. But she is capable of throwing out poison that paralyzes the victim, grabbing it, swallowing and digesting it; bend your body in the right direction. And if you cut it into several parts, then each of them will recreate the same organism.

Returning to our history, it can be noted that although, thanks to the inter-factional struggle, the forces of Jewry were scattered and its participation in the supreme leadership of the party diminished, its weight in the life of that time did not fall at all. The struggle of the opposition led to the fact that, in the end, the party (its most active part) rallied around one program: forcible collectivization of the countryside and industrialization at the expense of funds received from the countryside. In another work, I argued the point of view that collectivization was the most radical, defining moment in Russian history of the 20th century. And in this turning point, Jewish forces played no less a role than in the Civil War. Yes, collectivization was, in fact, the end of the Civil War, in which the communist government could not defeat the village and was forced to retreat, passing to the NEP, u.

Collectivization was a grandiose breakdown of the social structure of Russia, which had survived from pre-revolutionary times. It was not for nothing that Stalin called it "the second revolution," "a revolution from above." In a few years, the type of life that had existed for centuries in the countryside (and the countryside by 1929 - it was 80% of the population of Russia) was destroyed: an individual family-labor economy. This scrapping was carried out with a tremendous use of violence, and not surprisingly, the peasantry fought as best they could, there were thousands of uprisings. Troops were used to suppress them. The practice of the times of the Civil War was restored, the members of the Politburo regularly received reports from the OGPU. And in the end, collectivization led to a grand famine of 1933, on the same scale as the famine of 1923 (this, it seems, has not happened in Russia since the Time of Troubles).

Of course, collectivization was carried out by the entire party and especially its leaders: Stalin, Molotov, etc. But the number of Jewish surnames in this process is amazing. One of the most important organizers of collectivization was Yakovlev (Epshtein) People's Commissar of Agriculture of the USSR, head. agricultural department of the Central Committee, chairman of the Politburo commission for the preparation of a decree on the rate of collectivization. The chairman of the collective farm center was Kaminsky, then Belenky. The chairman of the Tsentrosoyuz was Khinchuk, then Zelensky, his deputy Kissin, the chairman of the Zernotrest Kalmanovich, the chairman of the agricultural section of the Russian Trade Union - Rosit. Special commissions of the Politburo were sent to especially critical areas: to the Ukraine, headed by Molotov, to the North Caucasus, headed by Kaganovich. At that time 15 thousand people were arrested in the Kuban as part of the "fight against sabotage". Molotov issued a "directive" in Ukraine, together with the secretary of the Central Committee for Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine, Khatayevich, demanding "repression and merciless reprisals against criminal elements in the

management of collective farms." Before that, Khatayevich carried out collectivization on the Volga, where he was the secretary of the CPSU (b) of the Middle Volga region. Another time, Kaganovich was sent to Ukraine, from where he immediately telegraphed to Stalin that he had arrested three directors of state farms. (On the telegram Stalin's note: "Good.") From Odessa, he (together with the head of the GPU of Ukraine Balitsky) informs that 500 families must be evicted from the Odessa region to the North. In Kazakhstan, collectivization was carried out by Shaya Goloshchekin (formerly the organizer of the murder of Nicholas II and his family). As a result, almost all of the cattle was destroyed, the Kazakh nomads fled to China or perished. Collectivization campaign across the country "theoretically" supported by the magazine "On the Agrarian Front", which was edited by Kritsman. Many less influential names could be named such as Ancelovich, Wolf, Nusinov, Reiter ... All these people participated in the planning and implementation of collectivization. Their signatures are under decrees that specifically spell out measures to be taken in certain areas and at certain stages. Their names are among the participants in the meetings planning these measures. Of course, Molotov, Andreev, Zhdanov, Ordzhonikidze, Kalinin also actively participated (in leading roles) in carrying out collectivization ... and the supreme leadership was in the hands of Stalin. But they did not belong to one small (numerically) ethnic minority. Many less influential names could be named such as Ancelovich, Wolf, Nusinov, Reiter ... All these people participated in the planning and implementation of collectivization. Their signatures are under decrees that specifically spell out measures to be taken in certain areas and at certain stages. Their names are among the participants in the meetings planning these measures. Of course, Molotov, Andreev, Zhdanov, Ordzhonikidze, Kalinin also actively participated (in leading roles) in carrying out collectivization ... and the supreme leadership was in the hands of Stalin. But they did not belong to one small (numerically) ethnic minority. Many less influential names could be named such as Ancelovich, Wolf, Nusinov, Reiter ... All these people participated in the planning and implementation of collectivization. Their signatures are under decrees that specifically spell out measures to be taken in certain areas and at certain stages. Their names are among the participants in the meetings planning these measures. Of course, Molotov, Andreev, Zhdanov, Ordzhonikidze, Kalinin also actively participated (in leading roles) in carrying out collectivization ... and the supreme leadership was in the hands of Stalin. But they did not belong to one small (numerically) ethnic minority. taken in certain areas and at certain stages. Their names are among the participants in the meetings planning these measures. Of course, Molotov, Andreev, Zhdanov, Ordzhonikidze, Kalinin also actively participated (in leading roles) in carrying out collectivization ... and the supreme leadership was in the hands of Stalin. But they did not belong to one small (numerically) ethnic minority. taken in certain areas and at certain stages. Their names are among the participants in the meetings planning these measures. Of course, Molotov, Andreev, Zhdanov, Ordzhonikidze, Kalinin also actively participated (in leading roles) in carrying out collectivization ... and the supreme leadership was in the hands of Stalin. But they did not belong to one small (numerically) ethnic minority.

The party succeeded in collectivizing what it could not do in the Civil War to destroy the peasantry "as a class." It is clear that this was a difficult, risky task: it was not for nothing

that a party of 6 years (from the 13th to the 16th Congress) hesitated before daring to carry it out. And it was carried out under tremendous terrorist pressure, which was called "dispossession". As a centralized operation, planned by the Central Committee, peasants were arrested, sent to concentration camps, and sent to the North. Even according to official reports, it is possible to trace the expulsion of about 2 million people (Stalin told Churchill about ten million kulaks). All this part of the collectivization was carried out by the OGPU. And here we see, perhaps, an even greater concentration of Jewish names than in the Cheka during the civil war.

In fact, Yagoda (Yehuda) supervised the work of the OGPU under the ailing chairman of the OGPU Menzhinsky. One of the most famous concentration camps, where the arrested peasants were kept, was the "Belomorkanal": the construction of the White Sea-Baltic Canal. In connection with the completion of the construction of the canal, the Order of Lenin (then the highest award) was awarded to the following persons:

Berry, Kogan, Berman, Firin, Rapoport, Zhuk, Frenkel, Verzhbitsky.

(Verzhbitsky was added here for educational purposes - he was a "sabotage engineer" re-educated in the camp.)

It is not for nothing in the "Concise Jewish Encyclopedia" published after the war in Jerusalem after the title of the article: Concentration camps, in small print - German. Otherwise, I would have to remember about the "White Sea Canal" and the entire GULAG

The OGPU had an economic department and, in addition, sent authorized representatives (PP) in the field to support collectivization. So, directives in connection with the collectivization of the Volga region (Middle Volga district) were signed by: the secretary of the CPSU (b) of the Khatayevich district, PPOGPU Bak and the head of the ECO Reifschneider. The head of this ECU in Ukraine was Blat, PP in Central Asia was Belenky, across Kazakhstan Karutsky, PP in Crimea, in the Urals, in Stalingrad Rapoport, various leading positions in the ECO OGPU were occupied by Weinstein, Weisager, Volkov (Weiner), Genkin, Deich, Ershov (Lurie), Slutsky and Tizenberg, Felman was the assistant to the head of the ECU OGPU. And there are many names in positions in the OGPU that are not directly related to the village: deputy chairmen Trilisser and Messing, deputy. early GULAG, and Berman and Pliner, early. Special Department of the OGPU Leplevsky, Head of the Secret Operations Directorate of the Plenipotentiary Representative of the OGPU Deutsch, Deputy. early Special Department Zalin (later the head of the NKVD of Kazakhstan), the head of the special-purpose camps (also the construction of the Volga-Moscow-river canal) Kogan. And so on, and so on. - the list can be continued far, it is enough to look through the documents of that time, now abundantly published. Recently the "Memorial" society published a valuable reference book "Who Led the NKVD, 1934-1941", which contains brief biographies of the NKVD leaders at various levels, with an indication of their nationality. Even the tables of the national composition of the "leading elite" are attached. Although the period considered in the reference book (from 1934) falls on a

time somewhat later than collectivization, but the data for 1934 - 1936. should not differ significantly from what happened in previous years - the cleaning of "organs" has not yet begun. We see here:

end of 1935:	Russians - 31.25%,	Jews - 38.54%;
early 1936:	Russians - 30.00%,	Jews - 39.09%;

and this is despite the fact that, as can be seen from the text, nationality was determined as it was indicated in official questionnaires.

It should also be noted that collectivization coincided with the era of a new intensification of the persecution of religion, and especially of the Orthodox Church. There was even a resolution of the Politburo, which ordered, simultaneously with the organization of the collective farm, to close the church in the village. The anti-religious campaign was led by Yaroslavsky (Gubelman), head of the "Union of Militant Atheists": the "Godless Five-Year Plan" was announced, at the end of which "the name of God will not be pronounced in our country." (It should be compared with the fact that in the 1920s Trotsky led the struggle against the Orthodox Church, and Spitsberg was his closest assistant.) When Gorky visited America in 1922, his interview with Sholem-Ash took place. He was disturbed by rumors of "growing anti-Semitism" in Russia and said:

*All Jews, without exception, believe that it would be the greatest disaster that would lead to a terrible massacre, if, God forbid, power passed into other hands. The fire of anti-Semitism is burning in Russia as never before, and as soon as the Bolshevik citadel is shaken, the entire Jewish population will be sacrificed.*

Gorky agreed and replied that it was in vain for the Jewish Bolsheviks to participate in the desecration of Russian shrines:

*The Russian peasant is cunning and secretive. At first he will make a meek smile for you. But deep down he harbors hatred for the Jew who encroached on his shrines. (...) The Jewish Bolsheviks had to leave these matters for the Russian Bolsheviks (...). For the sake of the future of Jews in Russia, the Jewish Bolsheviks must be warned: stay away from the shrines of the Russian people! You are capable of other, more important things.*

Sholem-Ash continues:

*I drew his attention to the fact that the Jewish Bolsheviks do not spare not only Russian shrines, but also Jewish ones. He said that he knew about this and believed that the struggle against the ancient Hebrew language, with synagogues, especially with the best theater in Russia (! - I. Sh.), The ancient Jewish theater "Habima" - is nothing else, like idiocy and barbarism.*

(Here Gorky did not give advice like leaving this to the Russian Bolsheviks.)

Gorky believed that the second reason for anti-Semitism was the envy of Russians towards more talented and hardworking Jews:

*Russia cannot be restored without the Jews, because they are the most capable, active and energetic force.*

If the restoration of Russia is understood as the strengthening of communist power (including collectivization), then this observation is confirmed by the facts. The Jews provided the support vital to the communist government, far from only through participation in the NKVD. Ideological support was no less important. She was multifaceted. Consider an example of literature. During the 1920s and 1930s, a whole literature arose that propagated the actions of the authorities, seeking to create a spiritual atmosphere corresponding to them. For example, collectivization and dispossession of kulaks were preceded by a literary trend that sought to instill hatred for the countryside and the peasant, and all of these were embraced in the image of "Old Russia", "raseyushka". Of course, this stream of literature, which served the government, consisted far from only Jews, just as they were not the only ones who served in the Cheka and the NKVD. But in this case, too, the disproportionate number of Jewish names and excitement are striking, as it seems, the sincere sympathy with which they rushed to this field of activity. Of those who became famous even before the revolution, Pasternak and Mandelstam became their own people in the salons of the Soviet-Jewish elite. The fate of the representatives of Russian literature was different. Mayakovsky was eager to go the same way, but could not stand it. Gorky was an emigrant for 10 years, then he returned. (Which, at least in part, I think, is due to his pathological hatred of the village and the peasant. His return coincided with the "continuous collectivization".) Yesenin, in the poems of 1918, reflected the feeling of the then communist leaders, "storming the sky", remaking the world: logic ("dialectics") and even the aesthetics of violence and destruction. But after this isolated period, the entire social side of his poetry was a groan of pain. And no matter how to explain his death, it is clear that in that life he could not exist (for example, several, it seems, 8 cases were opened against him, some with charges of "anti-Semitism", in those years by firing squad). And they did not at all become "poets of power" Akhmatova, Tsvetaev, especially Gumilev, Klyuev. But after the revolution a new generation entered literature. And among them Bulgakov and Platonov were persecuted all their lives (and, to a large extent, by Jewish leaders), Pavel Vasiliev was shot. Sholokhov enjoyed the favor of the authorities. But "Quiet Don" can in no way be called a pro-Soviet work. Why it was published (with all the edits) this is, it seems to me, the true "Riddle of Sholokhov". that in that life he could not exist (for example, several, I think, 8 cases were brought against him, some with charges of "anti-Semitism", in those years by firing squad). And they did not at all become "poets of power" Akhmatova, Tsvetaev, especially Gumilev, Klyuev. But after the revolution a new generation entered literature. And among them Bulgakov and Platonov were persecuted all their lives (and, to a large extent, by Jewish leaders), Pavel Vasiliev was shot. Sholokhov enjoyed the favor of the authorities. But "Quiet Don" can in no way be called a pro-Soviet work. Why

it was published (with all the edits) this is, it seems to me, the true "Riddle of Sholokhov". that in that life he could not exist (for example, several, I think, 8 cases were brought against him, some with charges of "anti-Semitism", in those years by firing squad). And they did not at all become "poets of power" Akhmatova, Tsvetaev, especially Gumilev, Klyuev. But after the revolution a new generation entered literature. And among them Bulgakov and Platonov were persecuted all their lives (and, to a large extent, by Jewish leaders), Pavel Vasiliev was shot. Sholokhov enjoyed the favor of the authorities. But "Quiet Don" can in no way be called a pro-Soviet work. Why it was published (with all the edits) this is, it seems to me, the true "Riddle of Sholokhov". And they did not at all become "poets of power" Akhmatova, Tsvetaev, especially Gumilev, Klyuev. But after the revolution a new generation entered literature. And among them Bulgakov and Platonov were persecuted all their lives (and, to a large extent, by Jewish leaders), Pavel Vasiliev was shot. Sholokhov enjoyed the favor of the authorities. But "Quiet Don" can in no way be called a pro-Soviet work. Why it was published (with all the edits) this is, it seems to me, the true "Riddle of Sholokhov". And they did not at all become "poets of power" Akhmatova, Tsvetaev, especially Gumilev, Klyuev. But after the revolution a new generation entered literature. And among them Bulgakov and Platonov were persecuted all their lives (and, to a large extent, by Jewish leaders), Pavel Vasiliev was shot. Sholokhov enjoyed the favor of the authorities. But "Quiet Don" can in no way be called a pro-Soviet work. Why it was published (with all the edits) this is, it seems to me, the true "Riddle of Sholokhov". can not be called a pro-Soviet work. Why it was published (with all the edits) this is, it seems to me, the true "Riddle of Sholokhov". can not be called a pro-Soviet work. Why it was published (with all the edits) this is, it seems to me, the true "Riddle of Sholokhov".

On the other hand, there is a whole stream of Jewish names of the most different levels of talent and just abilities, who zealously served the authorities. For example, Jack Altauzen, Aliger, Babel, Bagritsky, Bezymensky, Bill-Belotserkovsky, Grossman, Danin, Ilf, Isbakh, Kaverin, Kazakevich, Kirsanov, Kron, Mandelstam, Pasternak, Rybakov, Svetlov, Serebryakova, Selvinsky, Slavin, Utkin, Shatkin, Sheinin, Yasensky. And for a long time Averbukh was their "political commissar". It is surprising how a sincere love for the authorities and their deeds is combined with a strong national feeling. And it does not even combine, but unites (the above verses by Aliger, the touching visit of the rabbi to the political worker Babel, the ballad about the "red-haired Motel" Utkin, etc.). Perhaps this association is most clearly expressed in one of the most talented of them, Bagritsky. He, more subtly than others, felt the pathos of what they hoped was happening: a complete reshaping of the world at the will of the rulers of a new life. And a complete change for this both aesthetics and ethics:

*But if he says "Lie!" lie,  
But if he says "Kill!" kill.*

Everyone knows his poems:

*Their delicate bones were sucked by the mud,  
Ditches were slammed over them,  
And the signature on the verdict  
curled Like a stream from the shot through the head.*

Of course, any power (and especially, power of such might!) Captivates crowds of people who are ready to serve it (some for fear, and some for conscience). And among these crowds there were many Russians. And, in particular, those who created this new aesthetics of destruction and execution. But here at Mayakovsky:

*The White Guard was caught up to the wall too!*

*And they forgot Raphael, you forgot Rastrelli ...*

somehow toothlessly the shooting is transferred to paintings and buildings. There were someone's poems that "a man was born to be shot," but they were forgotten. And Bagritsky rightly took the place of a classic in this flow. And in his last, his dying poem "February", he talks about the rape of a Russian girl. The national self-awareness of the "lyrical hero" is sharply emphasized:

*My Jewish pride sang  
Like a string stretched to overflowing ...*

And only then:

*I burst in.  
Without taking off your boots, without taking off your holster ...*

And it is absolutely not plausible that the poem, written with such pathos, was "pure lyric" only conveyed the feelings of the author. Obviously, this is a symbolic description of what the author imagined happened to the country.

It is interesting that the collection of memoirs of the poet's contemporaries published later (1973) reproduces this spirit more vividly, the closer the memoirs are written to that time, For example, in A.Adalis (1935):

*We belong to a generation that did not have to be disappointed. We really became "rulers", "winners", "owners" of one-sixth of the land ... Eduard Bagritsky belonged to the generation and class of winners. Everything that was conquered by them belonged to him.*

Babel has:

*I catch myself thinking that the paradise of the future, the communist paradise, will consist of residents of Odessa, similar to Bagritsky.*

Indeed, in this whole course the inhabitants of Odessa made up the majority. In my old work, I paid attention to the fact that the books of Ilf and Petrov, which gained such enormous popularity, were far from harmless humor. Speaking in communist terms, they "fulfilled a social order", and in more modern terminology they "dehumanized" representatives of alien, "old" strata of society, nobles, former officers, priests. That is, they presented them in such a way that their "liquidation" did not awaken any human feelings. Later, a work appeared, from which I learned that my guesses had weighty confirmation. For example, Petrov wrote:

*I conducted investigations, as there were no court investigators. Things went straight to the tribunal. There were no codes and judged simply: "In the name of the revolution" ...*

But such words, as the author of the work recalls, were pronounced during the execution.

And about Ilf, his friend, the writer of the same "stream" Slavin recalls that he gave his friend a book with the signature: "Major of state security from a sergeant of fine literature."

And after all, all that has been said applies only to literature. And there were similar "streams" in journalism (Ehrenburg, Zaslavsky, Grossman, Chakovsky, the Fridlyand brothers: Koltsov and Efremov), and in the cinema, which Lenin called "the most important of all arts for us" (Zarkhi, Kapler, Carmen, Romm) and in many other areas.

## **2. In a socialist country.**

There is a widespread, almost generally accepted concept of how the fate of Jews in our country developed during and after the revolution. This concept can be found in the writings of the most famous Western Sovietologists in the Western press and radio broadcasts, in our media. Most often it is expressed as well-known, unconditionally proven, no longer needing any arguments. It consists of the following provisions:

1) In pre-revolutionary Russia, the Jews were in a humiliated, oppressed position, limited by the Pale of Settlement and the percentage rate under the constant threat of pogroms.

2) The revolution liberated the Jews, gave them equal rights, and they took an active part in state and cultural activities.

3) Since the end of the 30s. internationalist tendencies in the politics of the party and the Soviet state began to gradually give way to Russian-nationalist ones. This is associated with the coming to power of Stalin. The position of the Jews also changed. They began to be ousted from many parts of the state and party apparatus. After the end of the war, the authorities began to pursue an openly anti-



Semitic policy, culminating in the "Doctors' Plot". The eviction of all Jews to Siberia was prepared, which did not take place only because of the death of Stalin.

4) After Stalin's death, the authorities switched to a more cautious but systematic policy of anti-Semitism, which continued until the collapse of the communist system. Jews were then the most discriminated nation in the Soviet Union. Their national culture did not develop, they faced constant discrimination in their work, access to higher education was difficult for their children, and Jewish emigration was arbitrarily restricted.

We have seen that the first two positions are very far from the objective picture of history. As for the latter two, they are also a shining example of the Jewish ability to impose, to inspire others with their point of view, no matter how it diverges from the facts.

Regarding the period that we talked about before at the beginning of the 1930s, the above facts speak for themselves. The Jews were clearly the mainstay of the system at this time. Although the dispute about the timing of the massive compulsory collectivization took place at the very top between Stalin, Molotov, Kuibyshev on the one hand and Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsk on the other, the line of development that was realized clearly corresponded to the desires of Jewry. Otherwise, it would not have taken such an energetic participation in its implementation, and the authorities would not have allowed representatives of a disaffected or at least not sympathetic minority to take such responsible posts.

Some questions, indeed, might arise a little later, in the second half of the 1930s, when such familiar names of the Jewish leaders of the party flashed at the show trials: Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Rozengolts, Yagoda ... Questions might arise, but, strangely, did not arise. This is very strange, considering the constant Jewish excitement and the tendency to see persecutions everywhere. For example, at the end of the 1980s. in Russia there was a society "Memory". It is difficult now to recall the uproar that then began all over the world, with the exposure of the "growth of anti-Semitism" and the "threat of pogroms." There was even a special resolution of the European Council with the requirement to ban "Memory". But she did not have *any* influence on life (except that gave rise to this noise). Now, 10 years later, this is obvious, and even then, if desired, it was easy to see. While in the 1930s all Jewish members of the Politburo (except for the temporarily escaped Trotsky) were shot and it seemed there was something to think about! And at the same time, I, for example, do not know about any accusations of "anti-Semitism" of the USSR leadership that were expressed at that time. (Apart from the fact that Trotsky accused Stalin of anti-Semitism, and Bukharin for one thing! - such an internationalist, so trying to dissociate himself from his national roots! But this was clearly a desire to use any weapon in the struggle.)

Obviously, there were some special reasons why this painful question did not arise. The main role, of course, was played by the general feeling of satisfaction of Soviet Jewry with their social status, which somehow became known throughout the world. This feeling was vividly reflected in the book "Moscow 1937" by the Jewish-German writer

Feuchtwanger. In general, it was an apology and praise for the then system of the USSR, including the question of show trials that worried the West.

It has subheadings set out in the margin: Satisfaction of the Jews. The solution of the Jewish question. Jewish peasants. Young Jewish intelligentsia. Jewish nationalism in the Soviet Union.

In the last section, the author states:

*The nationalism of Soviet Jews is distinguished by a kind of sober enthusiasm. The unanimity with which the Jews who met me emphasized their complete agreement with the new state layer was touching.*

The chapter as a whole is titled "Nationalism and Internationalism", but is mainly devoted to the same issue.

Another reason was the growing power of Hitlerite Germany. All propaganda in the USSR instilled a passionate hatred of fascism, in solidarity with the position of the World Jewish Congress (which, as mentioned above, called for a fight against Germany).

Finally, such an incident was an important indicator. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Jewish Telegraph Agency (ETA) operated in the USSR, independently of the official TASS, which disseminated its information about the Soviet Union all over the world. To this ETA in 1931, Stalin gave an interview on the ever-burning issue of "anti-Semitism." He said:

*National and racial chauvinism is a relic of the misanthropic mores inherent in the period of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism, as an extreme form of racial chauvinism, is the most dangerous vestige of cannibalism ...  
In the USSR, anti-Semitism is strictly persecuted by law as a phenomenon deeply hostile to the Soviet system. Active anti-Semites are punishable by death under the laws of the USSR.*

In principle, this formulation is nothing new; it only repeats the usual position of solidarity between the communist government and Jewry. (Except perhaps a somewhat strange comparison: anti-Semitism - cannibalism. Was it really supposed that "anti-Semites" ate Jews?) But it is interesting that this statement was not then published in the Soviet press, although for some reason it was published in Pravda 5 years later, in 1936 And in the same 1936, in Molotov's report on the new constitution on November 30, 1936, we read:

*Whatever the modern cannibals from the fascist anti-Semites say, our fraternal feelings for the Jewish people are determined by the fact that he gave birth to the genius creator of the ideas of the communist liberation of mankind, who scientifically mastered the highest achievements of German culture and the culture of other peoples of Karl Marx, that the Jewish people, along with the most*

*developed nations He gave numerous prominent representatives of science, technology and art, gave many heroes of the revolutionary struggle against the oppression of the working people, and in our country he has nominated and is promoting more and more remarkable, talented leaders and organizers in all branches of building and defending socialism.*

The repetition of the same non-standard term "cannibalism" suggests that both of these actions - the publication of Stalin's old statement and the passage in Molotov's speech - were deliberately committed in the same year. Together they were a guarantee of the communist leadership, which was supposed to calm the doubts caused by the large number of Jews among the victims of the then purges. Apparently, these assurances were enough. Here we encounter a special feature of world Jewish solidarity: the interests of individual individuals (sometimes a very large number of them) are easily sacrificed to the interests of the "collective." Likewise, the Jewish youth Grinshpan, who killed the German diplomat in Paris von Rath (and those who were behind similar assassination attempts), were not interested in how this would affect the Jews living in Germany.

The communication between the Communist Party and Jewry was maintained in this type of subtle ways. And it really showed itself in life. For example, as described by the leadership of the NKVD in 1937 R. Conquest (such an extreme and loyal follower of liberal views!) In the famous book "The Great Terror". People's Commissar Yagoda (Yehuda), deputy Agranov (Sorenzon), head of the GULAG, and M. Berman, economic department Mironov (Kagan), Secret political department Mironov, Operational department Pauker, Special department Gai (Stockland), Foreign department Slutsky (deputies: B. Berman and Shpigelglass), Shanin Transport Department.

An influential group of Jews was in the army. Among the newly established generals were Yakir, Feldman, D. Schmitt, the Air Force was commanded by Smushkevich, Gamarnik was the head of the political department of the Red Army, then this post was occupied by Mehlis (and earlier Gamarnik was occupied by Sergei Ivanovich Gusev = Yakov Davydovich Drabkin).

The weight of the Jews at the top of the state apparatus was very great. People's Commissars in the mid-30s were: M. Rukhimovich (defense industry), L.M. Kaganovich (communications), M.M. Kaganovich (aviation industry), Rozengolts (foreign trade), Gilinsky (food industry), Berman (communications), Khalepsky (communications), Weitser (domestic trade), Ancelovich (timber industry), Zelensky (chairman of the Tsentosoyuz), etc. Soviet foreign policy was led by Litvinov (Wallach) and the overwhelming majority of ambassadors in influential countries were Jews.

I well remember the atmosphere of triumphant Jewish nationalism in the late 1930s. Every year, with thunder and fanfare, the victories of Soviet performers in international competitions were announced, and this was almost without exception Jews. (And how many of them have stood the test of time? Who knows or remembers now the then-famous Busya Goldstein, Liza Gilels, Misha Fichtengolts, etc.?) The songs

of the country's most popular composer, Dunaevsky, rattled everywhere: his melody even became the call sign of the Soviet radio stations. (I remember the story of one of Shostakovich's acquaintances: Shostakovich, having met a woman, told her that he was a composer. Then she exclaimed with respect: "So you may know Dunaevsky as well!") The Jewish theater was so popular that even those who went there who did not understand a word in Yiddish often only to meet an influential person there. The newspapers announced triumphantly about more and more victories of the best chess player in the world, Botvinnik. The most famous singers of the Bolshoi Theater, the most published writers, poets, and journalists were Jews.

Jews were then both the mainstay of the government and the most privileged part of Soviet society.

And yet, the number of Jewish families in the leadership of the USSR (members of the Central Committee, People's Commissars) is somewhat decreasing. For example, of the People's Commissars of the mid-30s, whose names were given above, most were shot in the pre-war years. But still, the number of members of the Central Committee elected at the XVII Congress (1934) and at the XVIII Congress (1939) is almost the same, and among them there is approximately the same number of Jews. Among the people's commissars or persons of the same rank (chairmen of committees under the SNK) in the 1939-40s (this is slightly more than 40 people), we see L.M. Kaganovich, Zhemchuzhina, Dukelsky, Ginzburg, Zemlyachka (Zalkind), Mekhlis, Beria. For comparison: two Armenians Mikoyan and Tevosyan and one Georgian Stalin. So it is impossible to talk about any discrimination against Jews, but then no one thought so. The terrorist regime established in the country and in the party affected Jews as well as others. At the top of the NKVD, mass arrests were made, there were a lot of Jews, there were many of them among those arrested. But then I did not hear any complaints from anyone that the arrests had some anti-Jewish specificity, and then I did not meet them in the literature.

With the outbreak of the war, the interests of world Jewry and the communist government in the USSR coincided so much that it was impossible to say who was serving whom. So, in 1941, the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (EAK) was created, which included the then famous figures of the Jewish culture of the USSR: the actor (and the head of the Jewish theater) Mikhoels (Vovsi), the writer Kvitko, the poet Fefer, etc. Probably, the Politburo and Agitprop considered JAC as an instrument of Soviet influence in the West and especially in America. Perhaps some of the members of the Committee viewed the communist government as a tool for achieving certain Jewish national goals. But what did it matter? And for those, and for others it was necessary then (during the war) to do the same thing. The unity was so great that the successive EAC secretaries Epstein and Fefer, as well as Fefer's deputy, Heifetz, were members of the NKVD and this did not conflict with their national feelings (Fefer, for example, published his most nationally oriented poem "I am a Jew" during the war). The committee contacted American Jewish organizations: the Jewish Section of the International Labor Order, the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists and Scientists, and the Jewish Council for Aid to Russia. On their behalf, as representatives

of the EAK, Mikhoels and Fefer received an invitation to the United States. A private touch that characterizes this trip (1943) is that (as one of the leaders of the Soviet intelligence Sudoplatov says) Mikhoels and Fefer were received by Beria before leaving, who instructed them to "convince American public opinion,

But, in addition, representatives of the EAK met with the President of the World Zionist Organization (and the future President of Israel) Weizmann, President of the World Jewish Congress Goldman, Rabbi Weiss, Einstein and many other leading Jewish leaders.

### 3. Parting ...

It was only after the end of the war that it was gradually discovered that world Jewry and the communist government in the USSR were not the same thing and that their interests could diverge in some ways. The existence of some differences began to manifest itself since 1948, when the State of Israel arose. The very emergence of this state clearly lay in the area of common interests. It was proclaimed by the UNO Security Council, where the USSR not only did not use the "veto right", but also actively supported this decision. At a meeting of the Security Council, Soviet representative Gromyko said:

*The heavy sacrifices that the Jewish people suffered as a result of the tyranny of the Nazis in Europe further underscore the need for the Jews to have their own state and the fairness of the demands for an independent Jewish state in Palestine.*

The leaders of Soviet politics hoped to acquire a leverage in the person of Israel for influence in the Middle East, or by inertia they followed the tendencies of world Jewry. The USSR was one of the first states to recognize Israel. It is known that in the outbreak of the Arab - Israeli conflict, the USSR initially supplied Israel with weapons.

But then it turned out that the JAC played a certain independent role, different from the one planned for it by the communist government. It turned out to be the center that attracted the national feelings of the Jews of the USSR. Hundreds of letters were received there with appeals to help Israel more actively: some insisted on permission to go to Palestine, others offered to collect money to help Israel. Then it was something completely unheard of: a person who had a distant relative abroad or received several letters from there, was already vulnerable. But all the work of the EAK was known to the NKVD at least through the secretaries of the Committee. This was superimposed on the fact that the Ambassador of the State of Israel, Golda Meir, was greeted in Moscow by crowds of Jews (usually when she visited her synagogue). Meir herself always adhered to a pro-American orientation, which was soon adopted by the entire policy of Israel.

As it became known later, the EAK itself had already taken a step in this direction even earlier. At the end of the war, in 1944, he sent a letter to the Government, proposing the creation of a Jewish Soviet Socialist Republic in Crimea. It was this term that was used, so that it clearly meant a republic equal in rights to Ukraine or Kazakhstan, which,

according to the Soviet constitution, had the right to secede (not to mention its own Communist Party, government, etc.). This was also an unheard-of act in the life of that time. Among the leaders of the EAK they were already "dividing their portfolios": Mikhoels was expected to be the president of the new republic, and so on. (but judging by what I have read, no rumors about the future "first secretary" have survived, that is, the new state was not planned according to the template of a Soviet republic). All this was a direct violation of the basic principle of the communist government: "decisions are passed only from top to bottom." The government, which had just won a terrible war, felt omnipotent and could not yield. But all her actions show with what difficulty (or fear?) She went into confrontation. First, there was a Politburo resolution on the dissolution of the JAC with a very characteristic postscript: "Do not arrest anyone yet." Then the arrests of the leaders of the JAC began. Mikhoels was apparently killed by MGB agents, and he was officially declared the victim of a transport accident. For more than 20 years, the political elimination in the USSR has not been furnished with such a decoration. It turned out that the Chairman of the Comintern (Zinoviev) or the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars - the heir of Lenin (Rykov) could simply be shot. And to do so with the actor Mikhoels is too dangerous. It would seem that with regard to Mikhoels, Stalin could repeat his question: "How many divisions does the Pope have?" But in some other hierarchy Mikhoels turned out to be more dangerous and weightier than Rykov. The same stamp of caution, not inherent in the communist state machine, rests on the entire "JAC case". The investigation was conducted for more than three years, the trial took place only in 1952. The entire investigation bears traces of some kind of hidden struggle of forces, which was not noticeable before (in the activities of the Cheka-OGPU-NKVD-MGB). In the summer of 1952, the Supreme Court interrupted the investigation in order to send the case for further investigation. But the decision, apparently, had already been made in the Politburo. The trial took place, but it lasted two months (and not several days, as usual). The defendants were free to ask each other questions and challenge their testimonies. But their fate was predetermined, all members of the EAK, except for one woman, academician L. Stern, were sentenced to death (13 people). In other cases related to this, 10 more people were shot. A total of 110 people were repressed.

One can imagine the shock experienced by the communist leadership when it discovered that the "inextricable bond" connecting it with Jewry exists only up to a certain limit. It faced a force from which it had not previously separated itself and the boundaries of whose influence it could not determine. So, Molotov's wife Zhemchuzhina (Karpovskaya) turned out to be very close to Mikhoels, it became known that he called her "a good Jewish daughter" and compared her in the biblical Esther. It is necessary to re-read the "Book of Esther" in order to appreciate the significance of such a comparison. On the other hand, her relative tells about Voroshilov's wife (Golda Gorbman):

*When the state of Israel arose, I heard the phrase from Ekaterina Davydovna: Now we also have a homeland. I widened my eyes: this is an orthodox communist internationalist speaking!*

(And this means that the Soviet Union, as it was said then, "the homeland of the working people of the whole world" was not a homeland for it!)

And, finally, one of the shot members of the JAC was Lozovsky (Drizo) during the war, the head of the Soviet Information Bureau, deputy. Minister of Foreign Affairs. And Malenkov's daughter was married to the son of an employee Lozovsky Shamberg, while Lozovsky was married to Shamberg's sister. As often happened then, Sr. Shamberg wrote a letter to the Central Committee, in which he assured that he did not know anything about Lozovsky's "spy-nationalist" activities. And Malenkov divorced his daughter from Shamberg Jr. But it was clear that connections were formed here, breaking which, it was necessary to cut through a living body.

After that, a "campaign against cosmopolitans" began, which ended in the "case of doctors" and ended with the death of Stalin. It is these actions that are usually the basis for the assertion that after the war a "policy of anti-Semitism" was established in the USSR and even a plan was being prepared for the "deportation of Jews to Siberia." It is very difficult to reconcile such a view with the then real situation in the country.

First of all, it is wrong to interpret the "JAC case" as an action characterizing the special anti-Jewish orientation of the then Soviet policy. This "case" should be considered against the background of all the life of that time. For example, at about the same time, the "Leningrad affair" was developing, in which a certain "Russian orientation" was apparently considered a crime, although it was expressed much weaker than the "Jewish orientation" in the JAC case. It was about the proposal of a certain group of prominent party leaders to create a Communist Party of the RSFSR, to transfer its Central Committee and Council of Ministers to Leningrad. The main figure among the accused was Voznesensky, a member of the Politburo, for a long time the only 1st deputy of Stalin as before. Council of Ministers. Voznesensky is credited with mobilizing Soviet industry during the war and organizing its restoration. And nevertheless, Voznesensky, unlike Mikhoel, could be tried and shot. In addition to Voznesensky, Kapustin, Kuznetsov, Popkov, Rodionov and others were shot, and in total about 2000 people were repressed. If we consider the "JAC case" as a vivid manifestation of "Stalinist anti-Semitism", then the "Leningrad affair" should be considered an equally vivid manifestation of Stalinist Russophobia.

In fact, in both cases, the regime sought to control some of the national impulses that it had admitted during the war and for its propaganda purposes. These actions were only elements in the chain of measures taken after the war to consolidate the victorious and consolidating communist system. This also included laws on strengthening the collective farm system, tightening ideological control: in science (biology, history), culture (literature, music), etc. But now more and more all this background, which determined real life, is ignored and remains as if one brutal suppression of the germs of Jewish national consciousness, sometimes interpreted even as a continuation of the "tradition of pogroms and blood libel." In fact, the number of repressed in the "Leningrad affair" was apparently much greater than in the "JAC case". In all the cases I know of people arrested in connection with the "JAC case", the victims, although they were not guilty of

anything, but from the point of view of the then authorities violated the basic unwritten laws that seemed absolute: for example, they publicly greeted Golda Meir when visiting her synagogues, or were friends with foreign correspondents, etc. Those. from the point of view of the already strengthened (and still strengthened by the won war) communist regime, as it were, they claimed to be extraterritorial. In all the cases I know of people arrested in connection with the "JAC case", the victims, although they were not guilty of anything, but from the point of view of the then authorities violated the basic unwritten laws that seemed absolute: for example, they publicly greeted Golda Meir when visiting her synagogues, or were friends with foreign correspondents, etc. Those. from the point of view of the already strengthened (and still strengthened by the won war) communist regime, as it were, they claimed to be extraterritorial.

Nevertheless, the regime did not resort to the usual tactics of mass terror, not only against people who violated its unwritten laws, but also "with a margin", against entire strata capable of generating such people. It was clear that there were some frictions, but of a completely new type, which had not yet been encountered in the history of the communist regime.

Let me remind you of the facts. The expression "cosmopolitan" (often with the adjective "rootless") appeared in the newspapers, which, as it was clear to everyone, was associated with Jewish origin. Perhaps it is difficult to establish the identity of these two concepts: "cosmopolitan" - "Jew" (meaning the meaning that was then put into the Soviet press). It was felt that the term "cosmopolitan" was in no way applicable, for example, to Kaganovich, Mehlis, Howard Fest or Yves Montan. Rather, the term "cosmopolitan", in its then use, can be deciphered as "a Jewish nationalist acting contrary to the interests and policies of the party." The cosmopolitans were credited with trying to exert a corrupting influence on the patriotism of Soviet citizens, weaken the integrity and strength of the Soviet system, by infecting Soviet people with bourgeois ideology, to tarnish the historical past of the peoples of the USSR. On the other hand, the concept of "cosmopolitanism" was sometimes understood broader than its Jewish aspect. Thus, many scientific theories - such as Veselovsky's theory of itinerant plots - have been denounced as "cosmopolitan." At the same time, articles of a different type appeared in the newspapers - feuilletons no longer of a political, but of an everyday level, which described the fraudulent machinations of some businessman with an emphatically Jewish name and surname.

There were also practical actions aimed at transferring some Jews from their influential positions to less influential ones. I actually know one example: the removal of several Jews from the posts of heads of departments, as well as the transfer of several others from Moscow to work in the provinces.

Finally, the arrests were made. A group of doctors was arrested, accused of "sabotage" - killing a number of party leaders under the guise of treating a number of party leaders and attempting to kill others, including Stalin. Most of these doctors were Jewish, but there were a few Russians among them. However, the Jewish aspect of this action was highlighted by accusations of ties to a Jewish charity, the Joint. This case was dropped



immediately after Stalin's death. All those sentenced to imprisonment in the camps in the JAC case, as well as those under investigation in other cases, were released.

Newspaper campaign, dismissals, arrests, executions ... At first glance, we are faced with a typical Stalinist purge - like the persecution of "pest statisticians", "Trotskyists", "right deviators", like the purge in the army and in the Soviet apparatus in 1936-37 etc. However, looking closely, you immediately become convinced that there is some completely different phenomenon here. The displacements had a completely different character: from the heads of a university department - not to felling, but to the heads of a sector of an institute of the Academy of Sciences or another institute. The transfer to work in the provinces was not in the nature of a rude exile, on the eve of arrest. The person concerned was summoned to the Ministry, where, as a rule, he was offered to go to some distant city, like Vladivostok. But then something began in other cases impossible: this person refused, put forward its own conditions, and after long negotiations agreed to go to work somewhere very close, for example, to Serpukhov or Kolomna, where you can travel from Moscow. Even more indicative was the atmosphere surrounding those who were victims of such measures: meetings were not convened where they would be exposed of all possible sins, and their colleagues would repent of losing their vigilance, acquaintances would not turn away from them, at a new job they were treated without any suspicion. In a strange way, the atmosphere was filled with confidence that no catastrophe was threatening here. meetings were not convened where they would be accused of all possible sins, and their colleagues would repent of the loss of vigilance, acquaintances would not turn away from them, at their new job they were treated without any suspicion. In a strange way, the atmosphere was filled with confidence that no catastrophe was threatening here. meetings were not convened where they would be accused of all possible sins, and their colleagues would repent of the loss of vigilance, acquaintances would not turn away from them, at their new job they were treated without any suspicion. In a strange way, the atmosphere was filled with confidence that no catastrophe was threatening here.

Attention should also be paid to this side of this situation. The entire campaign was carried out by people with extensive experience in cleaning, who formed a known *standard* of how to do it. So that in this case everything does not go along this standard path: mass arrests of everyone belonging to the persecuted group of the population, the disenfranchised position of persons somehow connected with them, numerous courts, tens and hundreds of thousands of those executed - so that events *do not unfold along this familiar stencil*, special, strict and precise instructions were needed. Otherwise, the habit that has already become second nature would have worked. Thus, it seems to me certain that *this whole action was conceived as an action unusual in the previous policy, in its scale completely inconsistent with the usual patterns of purges, as something fundamentally different from them - and careful measures were taken to ensure that it was implemented in this way*.

How do you assess what happened? Apparently, we are faced here with the first case of some kind of friction between the Party and Jewry, with the first case when the interests of these forces in some way did not coincide. The fact that earlier, for three

decades, such a situation has never occurred, shows their amazing affinity. They do not coincide, neither one can be considered an organ of the other, but they are so closely related that between them there has never been at least the slightest noticeable friction. On the contrary, careful measures were taken to eliminate possible misunderstandings: Jewish support for Soviet power in the West, laws outlawing anti-Semites, or support for widespread Jewish cultural and national activities in the USSR. When, in the 1930s, a large number of Jews who suffered in the ranks of the opposition could cause the alarm of Jews, Stalin and Molotov come out with fierce attacks on "anti-Semites". All this can be explained only by the fact that at that time each of the two forces perceived the other as absolutely necessary for itself, without close cooperation, none of them could hope to achieve their "goals" (understanding this term in the sense that we indicated at the beginning of the work ). And this, seemingly indissoluble, connection appeared in 1948-1953. noticeably weakened. The meaning of the upheaval that took place then in relations between the Party and Jewry can be seen in the fact that they which we indicated at the beginning of work). And this, seemingly indissoluble, connection appeared in 1948-1953. noticeably weakened. The meaning of the upheaval that took place then in relations between the Party and Jewry can be seen in the fact that they which we indicated at the beginning of work). And this, seemingly indissoluble, connection appeared in 1948-1953. noticeably weakened. The meaning of the upheaval that took place then in relations between the Party and Jewry can be seen in the fact that they *divided* , henceforth began to act as two independent forces. Independent, but by no means hostile: the events that took place in our country during these years are only debates, inevitable when two such powerful forces are delimited.

An example of how closely the communist government continued to be associated with Jewry is the history of the transfer of American secrets of the production of atomic weapons to the Soviet Union. The most dramatic episodes of this story date back to the era of World War II, and the roots go even deeper, but even after the war, amazing events took place here. They are described, for example, by the head of Soviet intelligence in this area, General Sudoplatov. He writes that during the war, 90% of the agents from whom important information was obtained were Jews. The establishment of contact between the Soviet intelligence and the scientific director of the American atomic project Oppenheimer also dates back to the time of the war (the role played in this by the EAC was mentioned above). In more detail, Sudoplatov reports:

*In using Oppenheimer as a source, Vasily Zarubin's wife Elizabeth played an important role ... She possessed a classic Semitic beauty that attracted men and was one of the most successful recruiting agents ... She came from a family of revolutionaries, relatives of Anna Pauker, founder of the Communist Party of Romania ...*

This amazing woman was at first the wife of Blumkin, who worked (including) for Trotsky. She reported on him and he was shot. Then she was abandoned in the United States and worked under the leadership of Heifetz. The author attributes to their influence that Oppenheimer invited Fuchs, an emigrant from Germany, to work in Los

Alamos. She also played a decisive role in the "use" of Leo Szilard - a Jew from Hungary. After the war, Beria ordered to stop receiving information from Oppenheimer and Szilard and to focus them on the fight against the creation of the American hydrogen bomb. And Fuchs moved to England in 1946 and systematically passed on information to a Soviet agent until Fuchs's arrest in 1950. I can learn something about this period from my own memories. I remember how much later, in the 1970s, the late A.D. Sakharov told me, that Fuchs' information actually contained all American atomic secrets, everything that can be conveyed in writing. So, the necessary costs, fossils, human experience cannot be conveyed on paper - and Fuchs told us the rest. I remember that then it seemed to me too fantastic, I thought that Sakharov was exaggerating. But Sudoplatov's memoirs paint roughly the same picture. He also says that the data obtained provided the main thing: confidence that the accumulated stock of atomic bombs by the Americans is insufficient to start an atomic war before the mid-1950s. And the same memories of Sudoplatov show what a truly irreplaceable role in obtaining information was played by Jewish aid: from the main figures of the atomic project - Oppenheimer and Szilard, to "connected" like Cohen or the Rosenberg spouses,

It remains for us to consider the version of the planned Jewish pogrom and the eviction of Jews to Siberia. The concept of the "final solution to the Jewish question," allegedly prepared but not implemented by Stalin, is as follows. It is argued that Stalin intended to organize a show trial of "killer doctors". There, in particular, a new (in comparison with other similar processes) character was supposed to appear - a public prosecutor, this role was intended for Ehrenburg. The defendants, of course, must be found guilty and sentenced to be hanged in Red Square. But on the way, the indignant people execute them themselves and begin a Jewish pogrom. Protecting Jews from this pogrom, the authorities put them on a train and send them to Siberia. The construction of barracks for exiled Jews has already begun there.

When Stalin allegedly outlined this plan to his comrades-in-arms, he faced resistance: Kaganovich opposed and even tore up his identity card as a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee. Stalin offered to vote - everyone turned out to be against him. For the first time in his life, meeting the opposition of his comrades-in-arms, Stalin was so agitated that he suffered a blow from which he never recovered. It is worth trying to think over this story, as it becomes obvious that it is becoming more implausible. Stalin and any other entourage could not at that time (even if they wanted) to find support in the party for such a grandiose action. This is how Avtorkhanov describes, for example, Jewish influence in the Politburo of that time ("The Mystery of Stalin's Death"). Of the 11 members of the Politburo:

Kaganovich is a Jew.

Beria is 1/2 Jewish (his mother was Jewish, but more importantly, he relied, as we will soon see, on Jewish support).

Molotov

Andreev had wives of Jewish women

Voroshilov

Malenkov's daughter's husband was Jewish.

Khrushchev's son's wife was Jewish.

Terror in the country has not had such a scale for a long time (eviction of hundreds of thousands). I have already said that the oppression of the Jews was then of a very limited nature, in no way corresponding to such a cruel measure. The "courageous" resistance of Stalin's comrades-in-arms, especially Kaganovich, who earlier calmly betrayed his brother for death, looks unrealistic. But most importantly, tens, probably even hundreds of thousands of people should have been involved in the preparation of such a grandiose event. All Jews had to be counted (and a "definition" of a Jew had to be worked out: by passport, by nationality of one or both parents). It was necessary to instruct the detachments that made the arrests, to prepare the trains, even to change the schedule of railway traffic: several million people had to be transferred simultaneously from one end of the country to the other. Where are the witnesses of this? Since then, several hundred thousand people have emigrated from various strata of Soviet society: there should have been witnesses among them, and, of course, they would have told the details. Ehrenburg insisted that he was shown a letter from the Moscow Jewish intelligentsia asking for the eviction of Jews, and he allegedly refused to sign it - why did no one see this letter again? Dozens of such questions arise. that he was shown a letter from the Moscow Jewish intelligentsia asking for the eviction of Jews, and he allegedly refused to sign it - why did no one else see this letter? Dozens of such questions arise. that he was shown a letter from the Moscow Jewish intelligentsia asking for the eviction of Jews, and he allegedly refused to sign it - why did no one else see this letter? Dozens of such questions arise.

I later read with satisfaction in Sudoplatov's memoirs that he considers this version implausible on the basis of the same arguments.

In order to appreciate this story, it is very important that we know its origins. She appeared in the West and became known there from two "independent" sources. The first was Ehrenburg, who told Sartre about this in great secrecy. In other words, every effort was made to make this story widely known in the West. The second source is even more obvious - it is the Soviet ambassador to Holland, Ponamarenko (formerly a member of the Central Committee presidium and secretary of the Central Committee). (These sources were reported several times, for example, in Avtorkhanov's book *The Mystery of Stalin's Death*.) Thus, it is most plausible that this story was deliberately launched into the West by Stalin's heirs. Its meaning is obvious: it must. was to prove that the new leadership not only did not harbor bad intentions towards the Jews, but risked their lives in order to to save them from persecution. This assumption is supported by other similar statements. So, Khrushchev says in his memoirs that Stalin, in a table conversation, gave him the idea to arrange a Jewish

pogrom at one of the Moscow factories, but he, Khrushchev, did not react to this proposal in any way. It is also, of course, just a declaration of a good attitude towards Jews, for history itself, according to the mores of that time, is not real. No matter how Khrushchev treated the Jews (their support could be very important for him), at that moment they could not protect him from the fact that he would be arrested and shot on the same night. that Stalin, in a table conversation, gave him the idea of organizing a Jewish pogrom at one of the Moscow factories, but he, Khrushchev, did not react to this proposal in any way. It is also, of course, just a declaration of a good attitude towards Jews, for history itself, according to the mores of that time, is not real. No matter how Khrushchev treated the Jews (their support could be very important for him), at that moment they could not protect him from the fact that he would be arrested and shot on the same night. that Stalin, in a table conversation, gave him the idea of organizing a Jewish pogrom at one of the Moscow factories, but he, Khrushchev, did not react to this proposal in any way. It is also, of course, just a declaration of a good attitude towards Jews, for history itself, according to the mores of that time, is not real. No matter how Khrushchev treated the Jews (their support could be very important for him), at that moment they could not protect him from the fact that he would be arrested and shot on the same night.

Thus, it's time, apparently, to hand over this story finally to the archive, recognizing it as a legend, in which it is interesting only *for what purpose* it is created. The popularity of the legend is explained by the fact that both forces acting in this area were interested in its dissemination: the party leadership, which inherited power after Stalin, and Jewry. Stalin's heirs - because during the transitional period, when their power had not yet been established, they thereby demonstrated their disposition towards Jewry, declared that the existing disagreements would not develop into a serious rupture. Jewishness - since this emphasized the position of Jews in the USSR as persecuted, persecuted by the communist government, and this, firstly, mobilized them and the West to defend their violated rights, and, secondly, put an end to the delicate problem of their role in the Revolution and in governing the country for 25 years following the revolution.

In this regard, the question of the cause of Stalin's death involuntarily comes to mind. Of course, he died at an age when death, most likely, occurs for reasons that are not at all mysterious. But if we discuss the "mystery of Stalin's death", then it is very natural to put it in connection with the friction that arose then between the party led by Stalin and Jewry. As an important factor in this situation, attention should be paid to Beria, on the one hand, who for a long time headed the almost omnipotent security organs, and on the other, apparently relied on powerful Jewish support. This is evident, for example, in the struggle that was then taking place in the communist parties of the Eastern European countries. Apparently, their leadership was mainly Beria's henchmen. At the same time, it consisted mostly of Jews. For example,

*The first target against the positions of the power of Beria was Czechoslovakia. Beria provided all the key positions of power there to his allies.*

*However, one striking feature characterizes this entire action. Almost all of the arrested high ranks headed by their leader Rudolf Slansky (whose real name is Seltsman) - Bedrich Gelinder, Rudolf Margolis, Andre Simone, Arthur London and nine other protégés of Beria were Jews.*

Douglas Reed quotes a 1952 quote from the English newspaper The New Statesman that paints a similar picture:

*In Czechoslovakia, as in the rest of central and southeastern Europe, the entire party intelligentsia, like the leaders of the secret police, are largely Jewish in origin; ordinary citizens are accustomed, therefore, to identify the party bosses with Jews and blame the "Jewish communists" for all the troubles.*

In Poland, Beria's direct support was the head of state security, Jakub Berman. Of the three persons in whose hands the power was - Gomulka, Berut and Berman - the last two were called Beria's henchmen.

In this regard, it can be recalled that the "doctors' case" was simultaneously directed against Beria - he was indirectly accused of insufficient vigilance, and his protégé, the Minister of Internal Affairs Abakumov, was then arrested.

It can be assumed that Stalin, trying to become more independent in relation to Jewish influence, tried to limit the power of Beria, whose Jewish connections were, of course, clear to him. But did he make it? After all, the Jewish side, probably, not without a fight, yielded its exclusive position. It is no coincidence that when discussing any variants of the "riddle of Stalin's death" Beria turns out to be the key to the "riddle". After Stalin's death, of course, the question immediately arose of how further relations between the Party and Jewry would develop. It is unlikely, however, that the new leadership was ready to abandon the more independent position in relation to Jewry, which was achieved under Stalin. Perhaps this was one of the reasons for the overthrow of Beria. But, taught by the fate of Stalin, it had to look for some ways, to reassure the Jewish forces inside and outside the country that there is no serious aggressive intentions. Here the legend about Stalin's heirs, who risked their lives, saved Soviet Jews from exile to Siberia, could come in handy. Takal's scheme seems logical to me, although this, of course, does not mean that it has actually been implemented.

Discussion of the legend about the deportation of Jews prepared by Stalin slightly reveals the tendencies that prevailed among his heirs and leads to an examination of the post-Stalinist era. In this era, we meet with a completely new and extremely important phenomenon - the emergence of Jewish emigration from the USSR. Here again we are faced with the fact that on an issue vital to Jewry, the Soviet leadership yields to Jewish insistence. Earlier we met a similar example in connection with the creation of the state of Israel. However, now the situation is much more dramatic, since it was necessary to make a decision that affected not the territory located far from the Soviet borders, but the internal life of the Soviet Union. Moreover, one of the foundations of this life. It seemed that as long as the Soviet Union existed, there could

be no talk of any emigration, the monopoly power of the state over a person cannot be shaken. Suffice it to recall the laws on defectors: they were considered treason, and even their family members were subject to exile. Yes, psychologically, this attitude has been preserved: emigration was equated with treason. It is all the more striking that against this background Jewish emigration was allowed.

The very fact of such a huge principled concession is much more important than the ways in which it was achieved. However, these pressure methods are also interesting. Here, first of all, the American economic pressure is striking; it is usually considered the main factor. It is unlikely, however, that this is true. After all, after the end of the war, Stalin resolutely rejected the offer to join the Marshall Plan, the bait of billions of dollars in loans. And then the West would undoubtedly be satisfied with incomparably smaller concessions on its part. Apparently there were other, more effective methods of pressure. And since it is not clear what kind of pressure other than economic pressure could come from outside (the influence of "world public opinion" can hardly be taken seriously), it is logical to assume that it was the pressure of the *Soviet Jewry*, which continues to maintain an influential position in the party and Soviet apparatus and to which the Soviet leadership had to make concessions, no matter how painful they were for him.

Another touchstone for clarifying the relationship between the party and Jewry is the attitude of the USSR to the state of Israel. It would seem that it is such that it could not be worse. [This was written in the 1970s] But let's first of all discard the propaganda campaign, because in politics, "swearing doesn't hang at the gate". What remains is the supply of weapons and instructors to Israel's enemies in the Middle East. Of course, this is painful for Israel, when from time to time terrorists equipped with Soviet weapons from neighboring countries make raids on its territory. But Israel can respond to this with the same, only much more effective raids on the territory of Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Iraq. A serious question for him and for all Jewry is whether his neighbors can threaten his existence. Here Soviet policy underwent a decisive test during the Arab-Israeli war in 1972. When, after the outbreak of hostilities, the United States began a massive supply of weapons to Israel, the fate of the war was decided by whether the USSR entered the race with it in this regard. But the USSR refused the race, and the Arabs lost the war, which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. When, after the outbreak of hostilities, the United States began a massive supply of weapons to Israel, the fate of the war was decided by whether the USSR would enter the race with it in this regard. But the USSR refused the race, and the Arabs lost the war, which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance

from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. When, after the outbreak of hostilities, the United States began a massive supply of weapons to Israel, the fate of the war was decided by whether the USSR would enter the race with it in this regard. But the USSR refused the race, and the Arabs lost the war, which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it.

On the other hand, the party's struggle to maintain some degree of independence from Jewish influence continued. To what extent has this trend brought about social change so far? How useful communal, conscientiously processed statistical material would be here! Of course, we have nothing like this at our disposal. And the picture, the general impression, is determined by Jewish complaints that are heard here, and especially loudly in the West. But here Dostoevsky's words about a people who can complain louder than all others come to mind. And this has really been the case since antiquity. For example, Josephus claims that the number of those killed in Jerusalem during the uprising suppressed by Titus was 1 million 100 thousand people, while, according to Tacitus's calculations, the entire population of Jerusalem - men, women and children - was only 600 thousand. human. We meet a similar picture in almost all countries about which we manage to obtain information. So, at the beginning of the twentieth century. in Germany, newspapers often wrote about the unequal, flawed position of the Jews; societies existed to eliminate it. At the same time, in secondary schools (higher than the public school), the percentage of Jews studied was 4-5 times more than Christians, there were 5.5 times more students, and 20 times more professors and associate professors. Jews on average were 3-4 times richer than Christians, among directors of the largest enterprises they accounted for 13%, in supervisory boards - 24%, and in the entire population - 1%. (The information is taken from the book by W. Sombart.) societies existed to eliminate it. At the same time, in secondary schools (higher than the public school), the percentage of Jews studied was 4-5 times more than Christians, there were 5.5 times more students, and 20 times more professors and associate professors. Jews on average were 3-4 times richer than Christians, among directors of the largest enterprises they accounted for 13%, in



supervisory boards - 24%, and in the entire population - 1%. (The information is taken from the book by W. Sombart.) societies existed to eliminate it. At the same time, in secondary schools (higher than the public school), the percentage of Jews studied was 4-5 times more than Christians, there were 5.5 times more students, and 20 times more professors and associate professors. Jews on average were 3-4 times richer than Christians, among directors of the largest enterprises they accounted for 13%, in supervisory boards - 24%, and in the entire population - 1%. (The information is taken from the book by W. Sombart.)

We have already reminded that at the beginning of the century Max Nordau quite seriously stated that Jews are the poorest nation in the world. Poorer than the Eskimos. In 1911 (at the 9th Zionist Congress), he spoke about the persecution of Jews - "a crime against millions of innocent people, unprecedented in history so full of beatings" (!). Now it is not even possible to understand what kind of oppression of the Jews he had in mind. Even now, with the unprecedented domination of Jews in the United States, there is an "Anti-Defamation League" there, which aims to fight discrimination against Jews. More recently, she issued a statement that the number of Jews employed in the banking business is too small, that this business is a bastion of anti-Semitism!

So we will not rely on the picture assimilated by the whole world, but turn to those scraps of facts that we can still get.

Apparently, there is no doubt that gradually many Jews were ousted from some of the most important, key positions of Soviet society: the top of the party (for example, secretaries of regional committees), generals, the uppermost layer of the diplomatic corps, perhaps the leadership of the KGB. But this is still very far from discrimination of the entire Jewish population, to attempts to lower its social status. (Why, in fact, the presence of a significant group of Jews in the Politburo or the Council of Ministers would help to raise the status of all Jews? To explain, one would have to assume that, in high positions, Jews act not as representatives of a party or state, but as Jewish nationalists, representatives of Jewry. But it is precisely such a conclusion that Jews usually resent with indignation as "anti-Semitic.") How was it not? This is where we enter an area where factual evidence is negligible. Of course, in some places they tried to restrict the admission of Jews to work; in some (literally, several) higher educational institutions, the admission of Jews was limited. On the other hand, there is no doubt that in many areas their influence remained very strong. For example, in science. In the field of ideology. So, in the Academy of Sciences, among academicians and corresponding members, Jews accounted for more than 10% (and in the whole country - only 0.8%). There were even more Jews in the Union of Soviet Writers or the Union of Soviet Composers. Unfortunately, the reference books published in our country, as a rule, bypassed the question of nationality (and I cannot think of another explanation as a desire not to sharpen the topic discussed here). But there was an exception: the directory of the Union of Composers of the RSFSR for 1968-1972. indicates the national composition of the Union (the oversight of the beat was corrected, and in the next editions these data disappeared). We learn that as of June 1, 1973, out of 874 members

of the Union, Russians - 484, Jews - 218, followed by Armenians - 34, Tatars - 25, etc. Jews make up about 1/4 of all members of the Union. In the Leningrad organization there are even more than 36% of them, in the Moscow - 28.5% - due to the fact that in Chuvashia - 0, Buryatia - 0, Voronezh organization - 0, Upper Volga - 1 (for 20 members), etc. It is necessary to take into account the very principle of counting: nationality is determined by a survey or by a passport. And with this principle of counting (adopted in the census), Jews accounted for 0.8% of the population in 1970. Nowadays the majority of Jews are registered as Russians according to their passports. Consequently, in reality, the number of Jews in the Sovka of Composers of the RSFSR was much higher: obviously, that the Jews constituted the majority there, and with the half-breeds the overwhelming majority. And in the memoirs of a composer who lived at that time, I found a mention that the leadership of the Leningrad Union of Composers was: chairman Fingert, executive secretary Jochelson, second secretary Kesselman, organizational secretary Kurz.

I will also refer to a recent book by V. Toporov. In the preface, the author says that he is a 100% Jew, baptized by a nanny who was fired for this, an atheist and a Russian patriot. That is, he everywhere feels out of place, and this pushes him to a kind of observation, often disguised as the reader's fractions (the subtitle of the book is the confessions of a brawler. So he writes:

*The petty-bourgeois mass of small-town Jewry formed the main personnel reserve of the social - proletarian in self-name and goal-setting - revolution.*

And referring to the alleged interlocutor - a Jew, he says:

*Reject the accusation of the Jewish yoke of 1917-1937 - there was no such yoke. Although, do not forget about the exclusive Jewish predominance in the punitive and propaganda systems of a self-fulfilling Utopia.*

And specifically he reports about the "pre-perestroika" time:

*About eighty percent of the Leningrad Writers' Organization consisted of explicit or disguised Jews.*

Both the material and social situation (the opportunity to get a better job, study) is much higher among the urban population than in the countryside, especially in large cities, and the population of Moscow was (as now) the chosen elite. Therefore, an important social characteristic of the position of any group of the population is its distribution between the countryside, city, big cities and Moscow. In this regard, we present data from the Jewish samizdat magazine "Culture":

*Almost all Jews (96-98%) live in cities, and in large cities in disproportionately large numbers than in small and medium-sized ones.*

*Further, the author cites figures: in Ukraine, Jews make up less than 3% of the population, and in Kiev - 10%, in the USSR (and the RSFSR) - 1%, and in Moscow - 3.5%.*

We will give some figures related to the issue of education. This, of course, is only one of many aspects of the problem, but it is typical of the general situation and, perhaps, it was on this occasion that there were the most protests at that time. At the same time, in order for our information to be guaranteed unbiased (or, rather, so that their bias could only be one-sided), we will take them only from Jewish sources.

An article by I. Domalsky was published in the Russian-language magazine "Time and We", published in Israel. In it, the author reports (referring to the Soviet statistical yearbook "The National Economy of the USSR") that in the 1972/3 academic year there were 4630.2 thousand students in the USSR, of which 88.5 thousand were Jews, i.e. 1.9%. If we take into account that according to the 1970 census, Jews constitute 0.8% of the population, then we see that even according to these data, the percentage of Jews among students was more than twice their percentage among the population. Access to graduate school and further to scientific activity is indicated by other information from the same article (here the author refers to the brochure "Statistical Materials for the Anniversary of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR", which has not yet been sold to the public). Among scientific workers in 1973, Jews accounted for 6.1%. So, their percentage was 7.5 times more, than their share in the population! (Interestingly, the author - apparently with disapproval - emphasizes that Russians accounted for 66.7% of scientific workers, accounting for only 53.0% of the country's population, i.e. their percentage is 1.2 times more than the share in the population!)

And in a later book by R. Ryvkina, it is reported that the percentage of Jewish students was constantly decreasing - 7.5 in 1927. to 3.7 in 1959 and 2.18 in 1962. While the proportion of Jews in the population was less than 0.2. She writes:

*they actively used the rights granted to them and during the years of Soviet power, having successfully integrated into the social structure of Soviet society, they achieved a lot.*

*The first post-war years caused a tremendous surge in the social activity of Jews. This "surge", as she says, and later created a kind of channels for the subsequent, smoother integration of Jews into Russian society.*

The author gives a summary:

*Jews occupied a very prominent place in the structure of Soviet society: the share of Jews among scientists, university workers, and medical workers was much higher than the average among the country's urban population.*

(Note that the comparison is made only with the *urban* population). For example, there were almost five times more scientific workers and university professors among Jews than among the urban population.

In another issue of the same magazine *Vremya I Us*, an interview with the sociologist Zeev Katz, who teaches Soviet sociology at the University of Jerusalem, is given. Mentioning that in the United States between 80% and 90% of Jews have received higher education in the past decade, and that the situation is similar in France, Italy, Argentina, Romania, the author continues:

The same applies to the younger generation of Jews in the Soviet Union. Approximately 70% graduate from universities and institutes, *being the most educated part of the youth in the CCCP* (emphasis mine - I.Sh.).

All the facts that I know confirm the accuracy of this last observation. And even much broader: Jews in the USSR in the 70s and 80s were the most privileged social group - in the field of education, access to prestigious spheres of activity, material well-being. They lived in cities, mostly large ones, and almost they alone had the opportunity to emigrate. Of course, they defended this position in the struggle and competition with employees of other nationalities of the Soviet and party apparatus, who saw in them dangerously influential competitors and rivals. But we are now interested in the result of this competition ...

And in the government itself, the position of Jewry was weighty. For example, Brezhnev had two foreign policy advisers. The responsibility of one was to formulate the foreign policy of the USSR in relation to the West, the other to the East. They are both Jews.

After the collapse of the communist system, a whole literature arose describing the oppression to which the Jews were then subjected. A typical example is the book with the dramatic title "Captured by the Red Pharaoh", from which we cite several excerpts (they refer, however, only to the period before Stalin's death). It contains letters denunciations to "higher authorities" or conclusions of commissions created in response to such "signals". Here are examples of the statements it contains:

At the Bolshoi Theater:

Director (acting)	Leontiev	Jew
Chief conductor	Lynching	Jew
conductor	Fire	Jew
conductor	Melik-Pashaev	Armenian
conductor	Steinberg	Jew
conductor	Nebolsin	Russian

deputy. director	Gabovich	Jew
branch B.T.		
thin Hands. Ballet	Messerer	Jew
head chorus	Cooper	Jew
head orchestra	Kaufman	Jew
chief concert maestro	bug	Jew
chief administrator	Sadovnikov	Jew

In the editorial board of "Komsomolskaya Pravda": half of the leading employees were Russians and half were Jews.

In the editorial office of the Trud newspaper, as a result of persecution, the number of Jews who worked in the editorial office decreased from 50% in 1950 to 20% in 1951.

In medicine: in Moscow there are 3 institutes of psychiatry, 4 clinics and 5 neuropsychiatric hospitals. All these institutions, with the exception of one institute, are headed by doctors of Jewish nationality.

I myself was a contemporary of such campaigns, often, in their individual aspect, very unfair - because quite often near jobs, they were fired (or transferred to another job) just more decent people. Many times I then wondered: what is it? Initiative from below or instruction from above? And in the end I came to the conclusion that - and that, and another. At all levels there was a struggle for a "place in the sun" and not only for themselves, but also for their children.

The process, in fact, was completely natural, which began during the Great Patriotic War. The mass of Russians began to make their way to power, in particular, to the party. A Jewish-Russian competition arose, largely unnamed, and continued for a long time with varying success. These party Russians, deprived of national identity, timidly stopped before a clear formulation of their ideology, it would seem, had no chance against Jewish cohesion, which still carries traces of "classical Judaism" and kagal organization. But in their hands were the mechanisms created much earlier, in the 20s and 30s, for the struggle, mainly, with Russian social groups: the descendants of nobles, priests, etc. It was a pervasive system of detailed questionnaires, "special departments" in all institutions, and so on. They used this weapon to fight their Jewish competitors. Their ancestors, Russian nobles, priests, peasants, perhaps, would disdain to use such means. But this was a generation that already viewed the established lifestyle as something set. And, as a rule, not the cleanest aspired to go to power, to the party. As a result, Jewry was basically ousted from some spheres of life, which it regarded as legally belonging to itself: the top of the KGB, the army, the diplomatic corps, from some prestigious universities in the capital. Of course, this was not at all like

the extermination of nobles, priests, "old intellectuals" in 1918-20. or collectivization. But for "Jewry" - for those who were "in the Jewish sphere", it was perceived as something monstrous, unheard of (I think quite sincerely). And Jewry recoiled with indignation from the communist system. It was a turning point that has been noticeable throughout my life. I remember how I noticed: earlier (for example, before the war), in the presence of a Jew (or married to a Jew or a Jew), they tried not to speak negatively about the system. And not always out of fear that he would report - but it seemed tactless, like talking in front of a man about the frivolous adventures of his wife. And in the 1960s and 70s. the Jew was usually a skeptic who did not expect anything good from "this system" or "this people." before the war), in the presence of a Jew (or married to a Jew or a Jew), they tried not to speak negatively about the system. And not always out of fear that he would report - but it seemed tactless, like talking in front of a man about the frivolous adventures of his wife. And in the 1960s and 70s. the Jew was usually a skeptic who did not expect anything good from "this system" or "this people."

Then the so (later) called human rights movement appeared. It would seem that there really were a lot of injustices in life and, mainly, concerning non-Jews: collective farmers did not have passports, religion was oppressed, etc. But in this "movement" the Jews were represented completely disproportionately. Take at least the sensational trials of that time: Daniel and Sinyavsky, Ginzburg and Galanskov, etc. That is, the situation was similar to what was in the revolutionary movement before 1917. And, more importantly, as a result, only the demands of freedom of emigration became audible from the entire movement - basically, it was Jewish emigration.

And the very strong desire of Jews to emigrate indicated a change in their position in the USSR, which caused their dissatisfaction and discontent. This discontent was vividly reflected in the publications of emigrated Jews. In my old work "Russophobia" there are many examples of contemptuous, directly hostile statements by new emigrants about Russia and the Russians. It seems to me that their mood was most accurately captured by the poet (I. Brodsky), who said about Russia:

*Where, roughly speaking, the grand plan is screw up.*

Apparently, there were some (perhaps vague, clearly not formulated) expectations about Russia, into which the Russians stubbornly refused to fit in. Reading the works of Jewish authors published in the West, I was often amazed at the time that Russians evoke more hatred than Germans. So, Zinaida Shakhovskaya quotes from Amos Oz's "Late Love", where the author indulges in fantasies about how Jewish tanks are marching across Russia:

*The Russian land trembles and groans. Churches are crumbling and falling. Kiev, Kharkov, Dnieper, Rostov - everything has been defeated, everything has been swept off the face of the earth. Revenge! Revenge!*

It was in this cauldron of emotions that the concept of the persecution of Jews in the USSR, or even of the persecution of Jews, as the main crime of the communist regime, was then formed.

But this emigration in scale could not be compared with the multimillion-dollar pre-revolutionary Jewish emigration. The overwhelming majority of the Jewish population remained in the USSR and continued to wage a stubborn struggle to preserve their privileged position. Then there were dozens and hundreds of ways to overcome the measures taken by the competing part of the apparatus. Here is a memorable history of those times.

The daughter of an acquaintance worked for a magazine that regularly published letters from readers. Many letters came there, where irritated authors wrote out the Jewish surnames, names and patronymics of those who were accused of some kind of fraud. And the head of the department where the letters went was a Jew. So he calls the girl and asks:

-Child, you're not an anti-Semite?

-Of course not!

-So why focus on these vulgar attacks? You change the surnames to some ordinary ones - well, there is Sidorov or Petrov.

And now a magazine comes out with descriptions of the adventures of the mythical Sidorovs and Petrovs ...

There were other ways, based on the influence that remained in the Central Committee apparatus and in the government in general. From time to time, those who too zealously tried to make room for the "Russian cadres" were paid with careers. A striking example was the fate of the party philosopher GF Aleksandrov - at one time the head of Agitprop and the Minister of Culture of the USSR. Even Stalin was clearly feeling his line here with caution. So, the writer Simonov says in his memoirs that once, when, when awarding the Stalin prizes, Malenkov gave the real (Jewish) surname of the writer who was published under a pseudonym, Stalin cut him off, saying that this was not necessary. And Simonov's position was clearly maneuvering between the two poles of influence.

On the other hand, the current situation is characterized by an interesting fact, which Solzhenitsyn draws attention to in his book. In 1955, Dahl's Explanatory Dictionary was republished. The cover reads: "Typeset and printed from the 1880-1882 edition." But the text associated with the word "Jew" and its derivatives: "Jew", etc., is omitted

(almost an entire page). In order not to break the pagination, a lot of coordinated work was required: editors of different levels, responsible for the set, etc. Why, then, each publication passed through the censorship (Glavlit). How was it all coordinated, how was it ensured that no one asked a question? Despite the fact that, for example, the words "katsap" and sayings like "Be friends with a Muscovite, and hold a stone in your bosom" - remained. What was so unacceptable and offensive? - I don't know. This is truly some kind of ritual action!

How did Jewry and, on the other hand, the communist apparatus react to the emerging division of interests? The reaction of the Jews (as always) was very harsh. In a few years, from the support of the system, it turned into the most active opposition group. A striking sign is the extraordinary participation of Jews in the "dissident movement". Without going into the analysis of this complex phenomenon, we note that not all "non-governmental" actions of that time were noted with huge Jewish participation. For example, when it came to the fight against the pollution of Lake Baikal, with the project of turning Russian rivers, even with alcoholism, with the senseless oppression of the Church, it could not be said that Jews are more active than others. The energy was mainly concentrated on actions that were deliberately forbidden at that time, outwardly of a protest nature: demonstrations, a press conference for foreign correspondents, the publication of a magazine (most often it ended in one issue). The samizdat magazine "Chronicle" was published for several years, describing the persecution of those who committed such actions. And the dominating themes were: "ban on Jewish emigration", "Jewish children are denied access to education", "anti-Semitism is growing in the USSR,". The same topics were picked up by the Western press and especially the radio - and in this way they were propagandized within the country on a multiplier scale. The Jewish orientation of this entire movement can be seen from the list of the most developed topics, from the names of the authors, and on other grounds. For example, in 1971, VN Osipov began publishing the samizdat magazine Veche (a rare magazine not related to the Jewish theme, published for 2 years). Immediately in the "Chronicle" a message appeared that a samizdat magazine of "nationalist-anti-Semitic direction" had begun to appear, and the message was immediately repeated by Western radio stations. Osipov still has connections (in the camp) with one of the publishers of the Chronicle, and he drew their attention to the fact that the magazine does not speak of Jews at all. Then in the next issue of "Chronicle" an amendment appeared on behalf of the editorial board - that "Veche" is not an anti-Semitic magazine, although it is nationalistic. Foreign radio stations, of course, did not report on this amendment. Osipov still has connections (in the camp) with one of the publishers of the Chronicle, and he drew their attention to the fact that the magazine does not speak of Jews at all. Then in the next issue of "Chronicle" an amendment appeared on behalf of the editorial board - that "Veche" is not an anti-Semitic magazine, although it is nationalistic. Foreign radio stations, of course, did not report on this amendment.



According to the Latin proverb: "after this does not mean because of this," but it is difficult not to compare with this "discrepancy" that at the same time the attitude of the Western intelligentsia to the communist government in the USSR changed rapidly and radically. After the war, Sartre wrote that rumors of concentration camps in the USSR should be ignored, as "this could lead to despair of the French proletariat." But in the 1980s, books on these topics became more popular - just bestsellers. For example, one of the French left, Pierre Dax, who during the period of "cordial agreement" explained that the camps in the Soviet Union were evidence of the complete elimination of the exploitation of man by man, now wrote an admiring preface to "One Day in Ivan Denisovich." The assessment of the communist system changes from a "brilliant experiment" to the "empire of evil". And there is reason to see the source of this change in the divergence between the communist government and Jewry. For example, the leftist publicist Isaac Deicher writes in Stalin's biography when it comes to the "case of doctors":

*Now Stalin struck a blow at the very root of the idea that lived the revolution, the state and the party; he destroyed both the certificate of revolution and the letter confirming the ideological legitimacy of his regime. By this action, Stalinism committed suicide even before the death of its creator.*

No matter how strongly this is said, it seems that it is close to the truth. Stalin, it seems, then ruined his reputation in the eyes of the West. Obviously, some vital centers were touched upon, in particular, those that determined the assessment of Soviet life by Western public opinion. Like a ship that listens well to its helmsman, this public opinion began to resolutely change its course. And soon the ship was already confidently moving in a new direction. The newspapers were full of statements from emigrants telling about the injustices and atrocities of Soviet life. The American Senate adopted a resolution on the dismemberment of the USSR. Left-wing French philosophers like Glucksmann and Levy were confident in their accusations against the Stalinists. Even among the Western communists, a trend of Eurocommunism emerged, seeking to somehow dissociate itself from the Soviet models.

What was the reaction of the communist government? Far from symmetrical! Even in propaganda literature, it was forbidden to mention Jewish influence. The expression "Zionism" was invented - formally using the name of the Jewish movement, which had the goal of creating its own state - but sometimes, as it were, hinting at Jewishness in general. This timidity proves that the government did not oppose itself to Jewry, did not feel it as its enemy. While the Jews who emigrated from the USSR filled the "Russian" editorial office of Radio Liberty and there they clearly branded communism with a slave and inhuman system, Soviet propagandists timidly babbled about "Zionism", reproaching it for eternal hostility to socialism and communism (Marx , Trotsky?).

Thus, in the 1980s, the communist regime completely lost the powerful domestic and global Jewish support that it had enjoyed for many decades.

## LITERATURE

Shafarevich I. Russia in the era of communism. On Sat. "The Russian people at the turn of the millennium". M. 2000.

The tragedy of the Russian village. T.T. 1, 2.M. 1999, 2000.

Ivnitskiy N.A. Collectivization and dispossession in the early 30s. Based on materials from the Politburo of the CPSU (b) and the OGPU. On Sat. "The fate of the Russian peasantry". M. 1996.

Gorky M. (ed.). White Sea-Baltic Canal named after Stalin. From the series "History of Factories and Plants". M. 1934.

"Brief Jewish Encyclopedia". Jerusalem. 1976. Vol.4. Article "German Concentration Camps".

Who led the NKVD. 1934 - 1941. Quoted. in Ch. ten.

Agursky M, Shklovskaya M. Cit. in Chapter 10.

Bagritsky E. Memoirs of Contemporaries. M. 1973.

Semanov S. "Merry guys" or some transcripts of the novels of I. Ilf and E. Petrov. "Muscovite". 1992. No. 1.

Feuchtwanger L. Moscow 1937.M. 1937.

Stalin I. Works. T.13. 1951.

Conquest R. The Great Terror. Riga. 1991.

Kostyrchenko G. Captured by the Red Pharaoh. M. 1994.

Vasilyeva L. Kremlin wives. M. 1993.

P. Sudoplatov. Intelligence and the Kremlin. M. 1996.

Avtorkhanov A. The Riddle of Stalin's Death. Frankfurt / Main. 1976.

Khrushchev N. Memories. "Questions of history". 1991. No. 11.

Wittlin T. Commissar. L. 1972.

Reed D. The Zion Controversy. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Deutscher I. Stalin. N.-Y. 1961.

Sombart W. Die Zukunft der Juden. Leipzig. 1912.

Nordau M. Max Nordau to his People. N. - Y. 1941.

Toporov V. Double bottom. Brawler's notes. M. 1996.

Aharon I. Study of the demographic characteristics of the Jewish population of the USSR. "Culture" (samizdat). Moscow. 1976. No. 7.

Damansky. Hate technology. The Time and We magazine. Israel. 1978. No. 25.

Ryvkina R. Jews in Post-Soviet Russia - Who Are They? 1996.

Katz Zeev. Interview. "Time and We". Israel. 1976. No. 4.

Shafarevich I. Russophobia. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Simonov K. Through the eyes of a man of my generation. M. 1999.

Shakhovskaya Z. Jews and Russia. "Bulletin of the Russian Orthodox Movement". Paris. 1983. No. 140.

Solzhenitsyn A. 200 years together. Cit. in Ch. eleven.

## Chapter 14. Modern West.

(After World War II)

### 1. Creation of the State of Israel.

The end of World War II coincided with a sharp increase in Jewish influence in the West. The most striking event in this direction was the creation of the State of Israel. The new state was created by a decision of the UN Security Council in 1948. According to this resolution, it was planned to create two states in Palestine - a Jewish and an Arab - and put Jerusalem under international control. Of these provisions, only one has been realized so far - the creation of a Jewish state. Jerusalem is occupied by Israel and declared its capital. More than 1000 years ago, then impoverished Europe opposed the much richer East and at least for a while won back its shrines. And now a civilization that calls itself Christian and apparently dominates the world, reconciles with the fact that the Holy City for Christians has been captured by the state, where the position of Christianity is very close to that which was in the Soviet Union and where, for example, public burning of the Gospel is possible, according to the prescriptions of the Talmud (Shahak cites the case of ritual burning - 03/13/1980 in Jerusalem - hundreds of copies of the Gospel by members of the religious group Yad Le, Ahim, subsidized by the Israeli ministry). Wherein *both* superpowers - the USA and the USSR - supported the decision. Moreover, in the immediate Arab-Israeli clashes, both of them provided military assistance to the Jewish side. Douglas Reed quotes from the New York Herald (dated 5.8.1948):

*... Russia provided concrete assistance when it was most needed ... Russia opened its arms depots to Israel ... At the parade of Jewish units in Tel Aviv, brand new Czechoslovak rifles flaunted on their shoulders.*

Even before 1948, the Soviet intelligence officer of the highest rank P. Sudoplatov tells about the Soviet supply of weapons to Jewish organizations in Palestine before 1948.

Nahum Goldman, whom we have already quoted, recalls:

*without the Soviet Union, the state of Israel would not exist at all. And not so much because the Russians voted for its creation, but because during the Arab invasion in 1948-1949 Israel received all its weapons from the communist countries.*

Ben Gurion reminded of this with his everlasting courage:

*"If now I accept you in the Jewish state," he told Israeli television reporters, "then we owe this much more to the Soviet Union than to the United States, because during our war of independence, when we were surrounded by Arab armies, we did not receive USA not a single gun. "*

By that time, it was probably already clear to everyone in the world that the Jewish state in Palestine would not be able to gather all the unassimilated Jews of the world - it could only carry out the old plan of Ahad Haam: to become the state center of world Jewry.

On the other hand, the emergence of the Jewish state created a number of painful problems. First, now every person who considers himself a Jew and has not moved to Israel (and such, for purely material reasons, will always be the majority), is faced with the question: a citizen of which country does he consider himself? The current exit, allowing "dual citizenship", can only be explained by the disintegration of public consciousness, which affected its main categories. Everyone can have only one homeland, so to speak, by definition - as everyone has only one gender. Of course, in both cases, some intermediate state is possible - but this is a pathology, as a rule, painful both for the one who is in this state and for those around him. Whatever stamps you put in your passport, most people retain the same feeling of homeland. Writing in the "gender" column will not change a person's attitude to this "item". And not only in the minds of a Jew who does not live in Israel, the question of his true homeland arises, but also in the minds of those around him. For some time, such questions can be squeezed out of public consciousness, in fact, achieving a special position for Jews in comparison with other peoples. But such tabooing is painful and destroys society itself.

Secondly, the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine made obvious a problem that had been hushed up before - the problem of the people who already lived there. We saw that there were contradictions and manifested themselves in bloody Arab-Jewish clashes (already in the 1920s). Earlier, there was a curious incident. At the peace conference in Versailles, the Zionist delegation met with the Council of Ten (representatives of the main victorious countries). Unexpectedly, one of the members of the Zionist delegation, Sylvan Levy, recalled that 600,000 Arabs already live in Palestine, that the Jews who come are richer and acquire the property of the Arabs, and the adoption of the principle of the "homeland" will raise a dangerous question about the rights of Jews to all this land. After that, the other members of the delegation did not shake hands with him in parting. However, the very question of the "national hearth"

But on the whole, the creation of a new state was an experiment started "in a clean place", without the burden of traumatic historical memories. The number of Jews living in Palestine under the rule of the Ottoman Empire was negligible (several thousand people), and Jewish settlers could re-create their own relations with the surrounding people - the Arabs.

The founder of modern Zionism, Herzl, apparently had in mind the creation of a purely secular Jewish state in which most of the world's Jews would gather, thus finally receiving the opportunity to live in their own country. Soon, however, the impracticability of this plan became clear. Representatives of Zionism such as Ahad Haam and Buber shifted the center of gravity to the spiritual side, viewing resettlement to Palestine as constructing a model for a new relationship between Jews and other peoples. Thus, in 1921, the KP, the Zionist Congress in Carlsbad, under the influence of Buber, adopted a resolution that said:

*Two great Semitic peoples, who have never been united by cultural creativity, will be able to unite their vital interests in a common cause at the hour of their revival.*

The resolution ended like this:

*Congress categorically declares that Jewish colonization work will not affect the rights and interests of the Arab people.*

However, soon Palestine was swept by a wave of Jewish terrorism, the purpose of which was to prove the impossibility of the coexistence of Jews and Arabs and to force Great Britain to divide Palestine into two states. The resolution of the KP Congress was pulled out only when it was necessary to prove to the British authorities that the increase in Jewish immigration did not threaten the Arabs. Ahad Haam wrote then:

*Great God, so this is the end we have come to! Is this the goal that our fathers aspired to, for which so many generations suffered? Is this the dream of returning to Zion that our people have cherished for thousands of years? Return to Zion to pour innocent blood on its soil ... If this is the "Messiah", then I do not want to wait for his appearance.*

In 1938 Buber wrote:

More and more voices are repeating: to live with wolves is to howl like a wolf. They forget that we came here to become human again.

In 1948, he protested against the prevailing view among Jews that they are victims in the Arab-Israeli conflict:

*Who attacked us? In fact, those who felt they were victims of our aggression. They called us robbers, and we told them that this land belonged to us 2,000 years ago. Let's stop playing with words! The truth is, that we ourselves began with peaceful aggression when we penetrated the country.*

Jewish leader Robert Welch describes the events as follows:

*Instead of a "community of interests", cooperation of peoples and a "common homeland" - there turned out to be deadly hatred and enmity, transmitted from one generation to another. 1/2 million Arabs fled from Palestine, Arab villages were razed to the ground, Arab lands, according to the law of war, as "property without an owner" passed into the hands of the Jewish state and were distributed to new immigrants or "rounded up" the already existing Jewish possessions.*

Indeed, the Arab-Israeli confrontation in Palestine has become the longest-running military conflict of the 20th century. Now 2.5 million Arabs have become refugees, more than 100 thousand people have been killed. The Palestinian Arabs are supported (at least sympathetic to them) by the entire Islamic world, where some terrorist

organizations operate. They committed a number of brutal terrorist acts: the explosion of a bus in which schoolchildren were traveling, the murder of athletes at the Olympics, the murder of individuals. How did the newly emerging state of Israel respond to this? The same terrorist acts, usually better organized and technically equipped. For the first time in the last century (if we exclude Hitler's Germany), a state has emerged that openly does not recognize any norms and laws. At the same time, the whole world puts up with the fact that otherwise would have caused the most severe repression: with the murder of UN representative Bernadotte, the bombing of the nuclear center in Baghdad, the occupation of a part of Lebanon, the massacre of Arabs in Palestine, the kidnapping, etc. For comparison, let me remind you: after the pogroms of 1938 in Germany ("Crystal Night"), also caused by a terrorist attack against a German diplomat, the famous sociologist Claudius-Müller interviewed (with a commitment to secrecy) 41 members of the National Socialist Party about their attitude to this event. Of these, 63% expressed unconditional indignation, 32% gave an indefinite answer, and only two approved the pogrom, "since terror must be answered with terror." The position of these two most extreme Nazis is shared by the State of Israel. At the end of the XX century. the USA and NTO (Iraq, Serbia, Afghanistan) adopted the same position of denial of international law. Of course, the main reason was the collapse of the USSR, the disappearance of the counterweight. But one should not underestimate the fact that for half a century there was a precedent, albeit with protests and indignation, but accepted by the whole world.

Thus, not only as a factor in Jewish history, but also for understanding the history of all mankind, it is important to understand the logic of such a special policy of the State of Israel, and from the very moment of its inception. The explanation for this is offered by Israel Shahak in the book we quoted earlier. He sees the reason in the fact that Zionism, which emerged in the era of Herzl and Weizmann as a purely national and secular trend, gradually began to rely more and more on the support of influential Orthodox rabbis and "classical Judaism" to strengthen its positions. Gradually, it was based on the so-called "Jewish ideology", which followed from the principles of "classical Judaism", as it is described in Chapter 4. In particular, the principles of the attitude of Jews to non-Jews contained in Talmudic literature were borrowed from there. This concept is also used by politicians for their own purposes. For example, as Shahak says, Ben Gurion was an atheist and even flaunted his disregard for religious rules, but during the 1956 war he declared in the Knesset that the real goal of the war was "to restore the kingdom of David and Solomon," and with these words, almost all the deputies they got up and sang the hymn of Israel. The repeatedly formulated requirements of "biblical boundaries" have the same religious origin, which extend (to the maximum extent) in Egypt - to the outskirts of Cairo, in Iraq - to Euphrates, in Turkey - to Lake Van, including Lebanon and Syria, Jordan, Kuwait, Cyprus. that the true goal of the war is "to restore the kingdom of David and Solomon", and at these words, almost all the deputies stood up and sang the hymn of Israel. The repeatedly formulated requirements of "biblical boundaries" have the same religious origin, which extend (to the maximum extent) in Egypt - to the outskirts of Cairo, in Iraq - to Euphrates, in Turkey - to Lake Van, including Lebanon and Syria, Jordan, Kuwait, Cyprus. that the true goal of the war is "to restore the kingdom of David and Solomon", and at these words, almost

all the deputies stood up and sang the hymn of Israel. The repeatedly formulated requirements of "biblical boundaries" have the same religious origin, which extend (to the maximum extent) in Egypt - to the outskirts of Cairo, in Iraq - to Euphrates, in Turkey - to Lake Van, including Lebanon and Syria, Jordan, Kuwait, Cyprus.

The main ideological basis of both domestic and foreign policy of the State of Israel is, according to Shahak, the legacy of Talmudic laws. He writes that as a child he studied the Talmudic rules about the relationship between Jews and non-Jews, and writes:

*It seems to me that neither Zionism, including its seemingly secular aspect, nor Israeli politics since the very founding of the State of Israel, nor the position adopted by the diaspora supporting Israel, can be understood without taking into account the deep influence of these laws and principles. of the society that created them and which they represent ...*

*The existence, as the center of Israel's politics, of an important component based on "Jewish ideology" makes its study a political necessity. This ideology, in turn, is based on the attitude of historical Judaism towards non-Jews ... It necessarily affects many Jews, regardless of whether they themselves realize it.*

*The tough attitude of classical Judaism towards non-Jews deeply affects its followers: not only Orthodox Jews, but also those who can be called epigones: the Zionists. And through them, it also influences the political orientation of the state of Israel ...*

The book contains many examples of the concrete implementation of such an influence, of which we can cite only a few.

First of all, this is due to the principle that considers the state of Israel as a "Jewish state":

*The position that makes Israel a "Jewish state" was from the very beginning of paramount importance to Israeli politicians and was instilled in the Jewish population in every possible way ...*

In 1985, the Knesset passed by an overwhelming majority a constitutional law (that is, more powerful than any other), according to which a party whose program denies the principle of a "Jewish state" or proposes to change it democratically is not allowed to participate in parliamentary elections. The principle of the "Jewish state" is that Israel "belongs" (this is the official term) to persons recognized as "Jews" by the Israeli authorities, regardless of their place of residence. Conversely, Israel does not officially "belong" to its non-Jewish residents. According to Israeli law, a "Jew" is one who has a Jewish mother or grandmother, or a great-grandmother (on the maternal side), or a person who has converted to Judaism through a procedure deemed satisfactory by the Israeli authorities. According to the fundamental Law of Return, such a person, upon arriving in Israel, automatically receives citizenship. For example, it can be elected to the Knesset, even if it does not know a single word of the national language.



Persons officially recognized as "Jews" have, in comparison with other residents of Israel, a number of advantages in the right to choose a place of residence or in obtaining a job, in general, this category of residents and other residents of the state are not equal before the law. Thus, 92% of the territory of Israel belongs to the state and is governed by the Israel Land Authority according to the norms established by the Jewish National Fund, an organ of the World Zionist Organization. These norms prohibit the right to reside and start a business for non-Jews, solely for this reason. As Shahak writes:

Such discrimination is formulated in many laws, even if they - no doubt to get around the "problems" - clearly do not use the terms "Jew" and "Gentile".

However, these terms are clearly contained in the Law of Return and other laws may simply speak, for example, of "citizenship obtained through return to the homeland."

Ideologically, the basis is the concept of "redemption" (or redemption?) Of the Earth. As Shahak writes:

*From elementary school, Jewish children are taught that this great idea is applicable not only throughout the entire territory of the State of Israel, but also on what, after 1967, began to be called the "Land of Israel."*

The official ideology recognizes as "redeemed" (or saved) lands that have become the property of "Jews", even if they were privately owned, owned by the Jewish state or the Jewish National Fund. The rest of the land is considered "not redeemed" (or occupied). The idea of "redemption" or "salvation" of the entire earth, i.e. the transfer of all of it to the ownership of the Jews, repeatedly, as the ultimate goal, was expressed by a number of Zionist leaders. As Shahak puts it:

*The utopia of this "Jewish ideology" adopted by the State of Israel, therefore, considers the goal as a land completely "saved", no part of which is owned or cultivated by non-Jews.*

Both the ideologists and the practice of the state of Israel Shahak considers impossible even to compare with the apartheid regime in South Africa (which still existed at the time of writing his book). In South Africa, 87% of the land was considered "owned" by whites, and 13%, in principle, by blacks, and there officially exist sovereign states called "Bantustan". But "Jewish ideology" does not recognize that not a single inch of the Land of Israel belongs to non-Jews. They are not recognized as entitled to any symbols of sovereignty - and this is strictly enforced. Shahak gives an example when in 1974 the Sheikh of Hebron organized a festival to which Arab leaders who were inclined to compromise with Israel were invited. On this occasion, his palace was decorated with his flags. But Jewish groups protested to Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan, pointing out that the flags of a "non-Jewish state" cannot be hoisted in the Land of Israel, this contradicts the sacred principles according to which the land "belongs" only to the Jews. Since these principles are recognized by all Zionists, the government was forced

to ban the sheikh from flying his flags, he, offended, canceled the reception and the entire Arab League took a tougher anti-Israel position.

Such a policy is based, according to Shahak, the tradition of "classical Judaism", as it developed by the beginning of the 2nd millennium after Christ. In particular, the principles of attitude towards non-Jews developed there. He's writing:

*Anyone who has lived in Israel knows to what extent this attitude of hatred and cruelty towards all Gentiles was strengthened and spread widely among the Jews of the country. Typically, these feelings are not shown to the outside world. But after the founding of the State of Israel, the 1967 war, and the rise of Begin's power, a certain minority of Jews, both in Israel and outside, began to speak out more clearly on this topic. In recent years, antihuman concepts, according to which slavery is the "natural" fate of pagans, have been publicly expressed in Israel, even on television - by Jewish landowners who exploit the Arab labor force, in particular children.*

## **2. USA and Western Europe.**

These morbid tendencies of the State of Israel would not be too significant for the rest of the world, like the "fundamentalist" principles that govern some Islamic states. But the difference lies in the fact that Israel has become the center of all world Jewry and exerts a strong influence on it, and through it, on the whole world. What is happening in Israel clearly shows what is happening in all of Jewry.

Again we quote Shahak:

*If the effectiveness of "Jewish ideology" depends on the relative strength of Israel, then the latter, in turn, is determined, to a large extent, by the support of Israel by the Jews of the Diaspora and, in particular, in the United States ... The strong pressure exerted by the organized US Jewish community in favor of any Israeli policy must be taken into account by any US administration when formulating policy in the Middle East. The same phenomenon is evident in Canada, which has no serious interests of its own in the Middle East, and which, nevertheless, is even more absolutely supportive of Israel than the United States. In these two countries (as well as in France, England and many other countries), Jewish organizations support Israel with the same unbreakable loyalty with which, until recently, the communist parties were betrayed by the USSR ... It is well known in Israel that the pro - Israeli chauvinism and fanaticism prevalent among organized Jews in the diaspora is far superior to the chauvinism of Israeli Jews. This fanaticism is especially pronounced in Canada and the United States ... But where does this chauvinism, often extremist, of one part of American Jewry but not shared by another come from? We must take into account the social, and hence the political, significance of Jewish organizations of the "closed" type: in principle, non-Jewish members are not allowed there ... These are those who*

*can be called "organized" Jews. They spend most of their time, when not at work, in the company of other Jews, supporting, I think, the psychology of Jewish exclusivity and the principles of classical Judaism in relation to non-Jews. They, of course, cannot freely express these principles in the United States, where non-Jews make up more than 97% of the population. But their true feelings are "compensated" by the support of the "Jewish state" and their attitude towards non-Jews in the Middle East.*

This situation is most vividly manifested in the United States, which the critic Kaizin wrote about in News Week magazine back in 1971:

*I do not think that anywhere in the history of the Jewish people there has been anything like the influence that Jewish intellectuals have on American culture. In this sense, America really is the biggest success for Jews.*

In a book by E. Nitburg on the current situation of Jews in the United States, written several years ago, it is reported that about 6 million Jews now live in the United States, who make up 2.7% of the US population. And 3.5% of the urban population. Among managers and administrators, their share is 40.7%, in general in elite professions - 71%. Their share among students is more than twice that of other parts of the population, and among graduate students - more than three times. They make up more than 1/10 of all professors, and at the most prestigious universities Harvard, Yale, etc. - from 20 to 30%. The book says:

*The main, backbone of the American ethnic community is its high organized part, represented by a system of closely related socio-political, religious, cultural and educational, charitable institutions and organizations that unite the majority of Americans of Jewish origin.*

One of the most influential "closed" Jewish organizations is undoubtedly B, nai B'rit, about which the Yudaik Encyclopedia wrote that it is one of the oldest and most numerous Jewish mutual aid organizations, united in lodges and chapters.

It also reports that it has (in 1970) 500 thousand members, 17,000 male lodges, of which 25% are located outside North America, unite 210 thousand members and have a budget of 13 million dollars. According to Nitoburg, it has branches in 40 countries.

In 1971, in a published letter to the vice president of this order, D. Kaufman states:

*Currently, B'nai B'rith plays a more significant role in deciding the fate and future of Jews in the diaspora, since she took on tasks that the State of Israel cannot legally fulfill, being a sovereign state and not being able to take over the affairs of others. countries.*

Its organ is the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). The powerful influence of ADL can be seen many times over. For example, in 1974 the ADL declared that Jews were

underrepresented in the American financial business! That he is the last stronghold of anti-Semitism in the United States!

The ADL's activities are multifaceted and have a long history: they include, for example, constant attempts to oust the "Merchant of Venice" Shakespeare from American cultural life, who through its efforts was banned back in 1933 in schools in Western New York and Baltimore. The ADL fights tirelessly against those parts of the Christian liturgy that it considers "anti-Semitic." It is difficult to determine exactly which parts of it, since such a point of view has been repeatedly expressed that the root of "anti-Semitism" is in the very existence of Christianity, which declares the Jews to be guilty of the death of Christ. For example, this is the point of view expressed in the cited book by J. Kats. However, without formulating its ultimate goal, the ADL is waging a tireless struggle in this direction. So, in the report for 1937 cited 759 observed manifestations of anti-Semitism, including: 74 articles and brochures, 115 lectures, etc. and 25 performances of the Passion. After the defeat of Germany, the Passion performance was under constant pressure, every 10 years at Easter performed by the inhabitants of the village of Oberammergau in Bavaria (since 1634, in gratitude for the end of the plague epidemic). In 1980, under pressure from the ADL, the American War Department in a special letter drew the attention of the American military serving in West Germany to the "anti-Semitic spirit" of this Passion in Oberammergau (personally a message from an American who served in the army at that time and did not want his name to be revealed). In the United States, the ADL secured a ban on public prayer and scripture reading prior to school. A number of trials won by ADL,

But the main goal still remained to overcome such a painful fact as the crucifixion of Christ - at the same time, the fundamental conviction for every Christian. In this regard, a great deal of work was launched by the Jewish branch of the Order B, nai B, rt in contact with the Society of Judeo-Christian Friendship. Representative B, nai B, rita Jules Isaac was received by the Pope several times. First - in 1949 - by Pius II, then - in 1960 - by John XXIII. The Catholic Church expressed its modified attitude in the decree of the Second Vatican Council "Declaration on non-Christian religions." This Statement was adopted by the Council on October 14, 1965 (by a vote of 1173 to 250) and proclaimed in the Pope's encyclical (Nostra Aetate - "Our Time"). It says, in part:

*... that what happened during the Passion cannot be blamed either for all the Jews who lived at that time, without distinction, nor for the Jews of our time. Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented either as rejected by God or cursed, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures.*

The adoption of the Statement was difficult at the council. First, an even more radical text was adopted (651 to 99 votes, with 242 abstentions). But dad postponed his approval for a year. Then the text quoted above was adopted. In memory of this encyclical - in 1986 - already a new Pope - John Paul II - visited (apparently for the first time after the crucifixion of Christ) the synagogue (in Rome) and said: with what other religion. "

N. Goldman also took part in negotiations with the Vatican. He was dissatisfied with the decision. As he says:

*the text adopted by the Council became watery.  
Since then, there has been a mixed commission of Jews and Catholics, meeting three times a year to identify and correct controversial passages in Catholic books.*

It seems that Christianity has not yet known such a public denial of the Gospel, despite all the persecution. Even during the French Revolution, when Catholic priests were threatened with a guillotine, they did not renounce the Gospel. What strength was needed to break the Catholic Church in such a way? In the course of the Middle Ages, demands were constantly heard in Europe to destroy the existing copies of the Talmud, since there were passages that were blasphemous and offensive to Christians. This dispute also spread to the New Time. The emerging humanist movement advocated the Talmud, and I. Reikhlín was especially famous for this. Now everything has turned upside down. Meeting the demands of Jewish fundamentalism, the Catholic Church abandons some central parts of the Christian faith. And this is not happening under the threat of medieval torture or the fires of the Inquisition!

Of course, the contemporary spiritual fall of the Catholic Church cannot be reduced only to the question of her relationship to Judaism. It manifests itself in other areas as well. For example, in many countries she abandoned Latin as the language in which Mass is celebrated, and the bishop who objected to this was defrocked. We have given this entire episode only as an example of the all-conquering Jewish influence in the modern Western world. Apparently, even more radical decisions were adopted by the synods of some Protestant churches (talking about the responsibility of these churches for the Nazi persecution of Jews. In most cases - about the responsibility of the ancestors) - this is reported in the collection of articles "Russian Idea and the Jews".

The main visible force providing this influence is undoubtedly the media: newspapers, magazines, television. And this is especially pronounced in the center of the Western world - the United States. Time magazine, reporting on the General Brown scandal (discussed below), quotes him as saying:

*You know, they own banks in our country and newspapers. Just look where the Jewish money is ...*

but calls this view "simplistic" The article cites Stephen Isaacs' recent book, *Jews in American Politics*, which cites the information that Jews are the head of corporations that own three major American television campaigns, are publishers of newspapers such as The New York Times, " Washington Post and The Wall Street Journal, but overall own only 3.1% of all American newspapers and about 8% of daily newspapers distributed.

Time magazine confirms that the three largest TV channels and three major American newspapers: The New York Times, The Washington Post and Wall Street Journal are owned by Jews (note that the director of Time magazine itself - a very widespread one - D Levin). In more detail, as early as 1896, the New York Times acquired A. Oks, who came from German Jews; A. Rosenthal was the chief editor of the newspaper, then M. Frenkel; the newspaper was owned by Sulzberger, and then. - Oaks-Sulzberger. The Washington Post was first owned by Y. Meyer, and then by his daughter Catherine Graham. The Wall Street Journal was headed by P. Kahn. This information dates back to the 70s and 80s, but it seems that the picture was changing in the same direction. For example. such an impression is left by Duke's book.

We have quoted Time magazine's statement about power over major American television broadcasters. It was then about CBS, ABC and NBC. They were run by CBS - Paley, ABC - Goldenson and NBC - Sarnov.

The same applies to major film companies, whose names (but not the current owners!) Can usually be seen on the movie screen. These are the companies: Walt Disney - headed by Eisker, Time Warner - Levin, Warner Brothers - Goldberg, 20 Century Fox - Chernitz; Universal Studios is owned by Sigran, whose president, Bronfman, is the largest liquor producer and president of the World Jewish Congress. The company "Metro - Goldwin - Meyer" also contains in the name the names of two of its founders (in 1924), and the third was M. Lev. Meyer ran the firm until the 1950s. Film historian Arnheim wrote: "Without exaggeration, it can be argued that the American film industry is the work of the Eastern European Jews who crossed the ocean in the last (ie XIX) century.

But the media, of course, are only a tool for achieving power. More real dimensions of power are manifested in the occupation of the highest government posts. This can be partly traced to the example of the United States. Jews have been systematically serving as members of the US government since President Johnson (1965) - Secretary of Education and Welfare Cohen. Nixon was accused of disloyalty to the Jews (there was a rumor that the tapes of his conversations with the assistants, whom they so sought from him in connection with the "impeachment", contained complaints about the growing Jewish influence). Nevertheless (and maybe that's why) he appointed Kissinger as Secretary of State, Schlesinger as Secretary of Defense, Barnes as head of the Federal Reserve Fund (an organization defining US monetary policy) and Garment, the head of the White House Department of Civil Rights. Ford, who succeeded him, left Kissinger in his post and appointed Levy as attorney general and Grinshpan as head of the Federal Reserve Fund. And so we come to the end of the Clinton presidency, when Secretary of State - Madeleine Albright, Secretary of War - Cohen, Secretary of the Treasury - Rubin, head of the National Security Council - Berger, head of the Federal Reserve Fund - Grynshpan The post of special representative of the Jewish community under the president is introduced - he is .... Footlick. But regarding the government of the new President Bush in the Washington Post, R. Cohen's article "There are no Jews in this government" has already appeared, where it is noted that the closest thing to this is only Linda Schavets, who is at least married to a Jew. Ford, who succeeded him, left

Kissinger in his post and appointed Levy as attorney general and Grinshpan as head of the Federal Reserve Fund. And so we come to the end of the Clinton presidency, when Secretary of State - Madeleine Albright, Secretary of War - Cohen, Secretary of the Treasury - Rubin, head of the National Security Council - Berger, head of the Federal Reserve Fund - Grynshpan The post of special representative of the Jewish community under the president is introduced - he is .... Footlick. But regarding the government of the new President Bush in the Washington Post, R. Cohen's article "There are no Jews in this government" has already appeared, where it is noted that the closest thing to this is only Linda Schavets, who is at least married to a Jew. Ford, who succeeded him, left Kissinger in his post and appointed Levy as attorney general and Grinshpan as head of the Federal Reserve Fund. And so we come to the end of the Clinton presidency, when Secretary of State - Madeleine Albright, Secretary of War - Cohen, Secretary of the Treasury - Rubin, head of the National Security Council - Berger, head of the Federal Reserve Fund - Grynshpan The post of special representative of the Jewish community under the president is introduced - he is .... Footlick. But regarding the government of the new President Bush in the Washington Post, R. Cohen's article "There are no Jews in this government" has already appeared, where it is noted that the closest thing to this is only Linda Schavets, who is at least married to a Jew. Minister of War - Cohen, Minister of Finance - Rubin, head of the National Security Council - Berger, head of the Federal Reserve Fund - Grynshpan The post of special representative of the Jewish community under the president was introduced - it is occupied by .... Footlik. But regarding the government of the new President Bush in the Washington Post, R. Cohen's article "There are no Jews in this government" has already appeared, where it is noted that the closest thing to this is only Linda Schavets, who is at least married to a Jew. Minister of War - Cohen, Minister of Finance - Rubin, head of the National Security Council - Berger, head of the Federal Reserve Fund - Grynshpan The post of special representative of the Jewish community under the president was introduced - it is occupied by .... Footlik. But regarding the government of the new President Bush in the Washington Post, R. Cohen's article "There are no Jews in this government" has already appeared, where it is noted that the closest thing to this is only Linda Schavets, who is at least married to a Jew.

Here I will quote from D. Duke's book "The Jewish Question through the Eyes of an American." As I said (Chapter 1), the author does not always carefully substantiate his statements. But on the other hand, the book contains many accurate references to books and magazines. Some I was able to check and they turned out to be correct. Therefore, I will quote him from the Israeli magazine (inaccessible to me) "Maariv". Written by Bar-Josef Avionat, the article is titled: "The Jews Ruling at the Clinton Court." It says:

*There is no longer a non-Jewish government in the United States. In the current government, Jews are full partners in decision-making at all levels. Perhaps some aspects of Jewish religious laws regarding the concept of "non-Jewish government" would be worth revising, as they are outdated in the United States.*

This could be considered an exaggeration of the emotional author, but then we read:

*On the National Security Council, seven of the eleven top officials are Jewish.*

This is followed by a list of them, and then:

*The situation is not much different in the presidential administration, which is full of zealous Zionists ...*

And again, a long list.

Finally, we can recall a number of striking episodes that have occurred over the past 30-40 years. For example, under Carter's presidency, the Negro, Andrew Young, was the US representative to the UN. He took an extremely independent position in relation to the presidential administration. He behaved like a spoiled and capricious child, all the time making statements that are very unpleasant for the Department of State: for example, that there are more political prisoners in the United States than in the USSR, or that Cuban troops in Angola are a stabilizing factor. Nevertheless, he got away with it. But now he privately met with the representative of the Palestinian Arabs to the UN Zuhdi Labib Terzi. A statement from Israeli intelligence followed, and Carter immediately fired Young. But Young was a very important person for Carter: he, as one of the most prominent leaders of the Negro community in the United States, helped Carter win black votes in his campaign. Young's resignation caused great irritation among the blacks. Carter was soon to be re-elected; he had to choose between 18 million blacks and 5 million Jews, but the choice seemed clear to him.

Another such episode is associated with a speech by General Brown, chairman of the United States Chiefs of Staff ("military No. 1" in the United States). We mentioned it above. The general spoke to students at Duke University. They talked about US policy in the Middle East. At first he was careful, but suddenly he broke away. Speaking of the "Jewish lobby", the general said:

*You wouldn't believe how powerful it is! Representatives of Israel come to us to receive weapons. We say that Congress will not support this, and they answer: do not worry about Congress, we will take it upon ourselves. That's what foreigners say, but they really can do it!*

This was followed by the above words about the sources of Jewish influence: banks and newspapers.

The same article gives other interesting details. As soon as there was a report (in the aforementioned Washington Post) about the general's speech, both the White House, the Pentagon and Congress were flooded with a flood of letters and telegrams containing outrageous protests. White House spokesman and Secretary of War Schlesinger condemned Brown's speech. President Ford summoned him to the White House Oval Hall and lectured him for 10 minutes. Senator Javits demanded an investigation, and Senator Proxmire called for the general's resignation. Brown himself



immediately apologized and said that his words "do not express his true views," and that the right to lobby one's interests is "the very heart" of democracy.

Finally, there was another episode that left a noticeable mark in print. It is associated with the fate of US Congressman Findlay. Findlay was a member of the subcommittee on relations with Europe and the Middle East. In this capacity, he traveled to the Middle East and met with the leaders of Syria and Yemen (in particular, to secure the release of an American agent convicted of espionage in Yemen). In 1978, he met with Arafat and spoke out in favor of negotiations between Israel and the PLO (which coincided with the then official position of the United States). Soon his position changed dramatically. His fellow party members recoiled from him, they were clearly afraid of him, even Reagan. Despite this, he managed to be re-elected to Congress in 1980. But in 1982, the constituencies were redrawn, additional elections were called - and he lost them.

But Findlay's reaction seemed different from that of the heroes of other similar incidents, he became interested in the phenomenon he faced, began collecting materials from the press, interviewed himself - and as a result published a book about the Israeli lobby in the United States, filled with a lot of facts.

There he describes others who paid with their political careers for careless, seemingly innocent statements criticizing Israel's policies: Congressmen McCloskey, Fauntroy, Dumalli, Senators Adlai Stevenson (presidential candidate), Fulbright, Aburetsk, Ribikov, Matthias, Percy, Ambassador West, journalist Roger Broderick, Ann Gayer, film actress Vanessa Redgrave, government official Quandt (deputy Brzezinski), Yanka, Professor Chomsky, EkbalAkhmat, Mather Hamid, priest, rector of the most prestigious Protestant cathedral in Washington, Sayre, etc.

The author describes various forms of pressure: organizing an electoral failure, the threat of a boycott in professional activities after leaving politics, disrupting meetings, breaking into apartments ... It should be noted that Americans are much more delicate people than we Russians. We believe that a person is persecuted if he is imprisoned in a camp, beaten or killed. Americans are susceptible to much more subtle influences: it is enough for a scientist not to be included in some additional grant, so that in the summer he will not be able to travel with his family to the Bolear Islands - and he already feels persecuted.

Findlay talks about what is happening in the military department simply miracles. Israel's negotiating officials are proving to be better informed about the state of American weapons than defense officials. They ask for the supply of weapons, classified back in the United States - and they are seeking them. If American representatives have any objections to Israel's wishes, they are afraid to entrust it to paper so that their careers will not suffer. Secret documents disappear in batches and many Israeli officials have been expelled, but the US has never formally charged with espionage. Military. Findlay says they call the Pentagon the "Israel Self-Service Store."

The usual means of pressure are calls and statements from congressmen claiming that certain supplies are absolutely necessary for the security of Israel. Congressmen, in turn, are under pressure from numerous Jewish organizations to mobilize their members for calls, letters or visits to Congressmen. Any intransigence leads to accusations of "anti-Semitism" or "hostility to Jews." "Lists of enemies" that are dangerous in this sense are being circulated. This pressure is so effective that in some cases educational institutions return money received for certain programs just because they were offered by Arab countries. In others, they refuse to cooperate with Arab Americans.

Here is a specific episode from this book. The well-known "Geographic Journal" published an article about Damascus, in which, in a small paragraph about the local Jewish community, it was said about its relatively favorable position. This caused a storm of protests, the editorial office received more than 600 indignant letters. She was required to publish an opposite assessment. In vain did the editor prove that the magazine had existed since 1888 and never adhered to such a practice. A stormy demonstration took place at the walls of the editorial office. The American Jewish Congress intervened. As a result, the editors gave up and published a statement saying "Our critics were right. We were wrong."

The press is so susceptible to such pressure that when the head of the Council of Jewish Communities, Berenbaum and other Jewish activists, met with representatives of the Washington Post, told them that the newspaper "has a Jewish problem", the newspaper agreed that, within a week Berenbaum oversaw the processing and reporting of the news at the editorial office.

Under such pressure, naturally, decisions are made that clearly contradict the national interests of the United States. As an example, Findlay cites the appropriation in 1984 of \$ 250 million to develop production in Israel of the new Lavi fighter, which was becoming a competitor to aircraft then produced in the United States. Moreover, 379 deputies of Congress voted for this decision, against - 40. One of the protesters said:

As a result, 6,000 jobs will be lost (...). Americans are not only being robbed of their dollars to create a foreign industry. They have yet to lose their jobs.

But perhaps the most dramatic episode in which American interests were sacrificed to Israel's interests is the episode of the Liberty ship. The episode is described in exactly the same way in Findlay's book and in Duke's book. There are also books specially dedicated to him.

The event in question took place on June 8, 1967, during the next Arab-Israeli war. Then the armed forces of Israel shot at the American reconnaissance ship "Liberty", and 34 were killed and 171 were wounded. The next day, the Israeli government apologized, saying it had mistaken the ship for an Egyptian ship. However, a number of authors who have written about it provide evidence that the attack was deliberate and, moreover, that it was known to the US government. According to the

recollections of the survivors, the attack took place in the afternoon, at 2 o'clock. The ship first flew over several jet aircraft. A light breeze blowing at this time fluttered the American flag, clearly distinguishable. Then the ship was attacked by Israeli aircraft. It was fired upon from machine guns, and napalm bombs were dropped on the deck. Then the ship was shot with rockets from torpedo boats. The lifeboats launched from the ship were also subjected to shelling. Moreover, there were two American aircraft carriers "Saratoga" and "America" nearby. Twice, in response to the Liberty's distress signals, planes rose from them to help, but were returned by order of the higher authorities (in one case, Foreign Minister Mac Namara). Only the next day, when it became clear that the ship stubbornly did not want to sink, help appeared and the wounded were evacuated by helicopters. Findlay, for example, claims that the authorities already knew that the attack was deliberate, and the CIA warned about it 2 days in advance. He believes that the reason for the entire action is the fears of the Israeli government, that the ship will set up preparations for an Israeli attack on Syria (which did indeed take place 2 days later, although Israel entered into a truce with the Arab countries). Findlay says President Johnson orchestrated a smokescreen that made the facts almost unknown even 16 years after he left. The US government has accepted the Israeli version. The appointed commission published a report in which it was silent that the ship's nationality was obvious long before the attack, there was no mention of napalm bombs and shot boats. The attack was said to last 2 minutes, although it took over 70 minutes. The surviving sailors were ordered to strictly adhere to the official version and not provide any other information. that President Johnson created a smokescreen that made the facts almost unknown even 16 years after his departure. The US government has accepted the Israeli version. The appointed commission published a report in which it was silent that the ship's nationality was obvious long before the attack, there was no mention of napalm bombs and shot boats. The attack was said to last 2 minutes, although it took over 70 minutes. The surviving sailors were ordered to strictly adhere to the official version and not provide any other information. that President Johnson created a smokescreen that made the facts almost unknown even 16 years after his departure. The US government has accepted the Israeli version. The appointed commission published a report in which it was silent that the ship's nationality was obvious long before the attack, there was no mention of napalm bombs and shot boats. The attack was said to last 2 minutes, although it took over 70 minutes. The surviving sailors were ordered to strictly adhere to the official version and not provide any other information. there was no mention of napalm bombs and shot boats. The attack was said to last 2 minutes, although it took over 70 minutes. The surviving sailors were ordered to strictly adhere to the official version and not provide any other information. there was no mention of napalm bombs and shot boats. The attack was said to last 2 minutes, although it took over 70 minutes. The surviving sailors were ordered to strictly adhere to the official version and not provide any other information.

The main source of the revelations was the publication of a former Liberty officer, Enns. For the (then) situation in the United States, it is characteristic that he was still able to publish his book in 1980, 2 years after his retirement. He secretly collected the

memories of his surviving comrades. The book provoked, Findlay says, internationally coordinated resistance:

*US Department of Defense, Anti-Defamation League, American Israel Public Relations Committee, Publishers, Media, and Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs.*

Annes could still give a series of speeches on the topic of the book, but he was interrupted there, called a liar and an anti-Semite. He continued to receive letters of the same content for another 10 years.

And despite such a public atmosphere, in 1984 Senator D'Amato introduced a bill on the need to "extinguish the outbreak of anti-Semitism that gripped the country" - and it was passed into law in 16 states.

President Carter has achieved a lot in foreign policy for Israel. Under him, the Israeli-Egyptian agreement was concluded at Camp David. By the standards of World War I or II, Egypt signed a "separate peace" with Israel. I then wrote down the following message from BBC to myself:

*The Sandy Times wrote on Sunday 15 October that "overnight, President Carter went from being an inexperienced meddler in other people's affairs to a wise statesman ... President Carter cannot be so incapable not to learn his lesson." (i.e. make the correct conclusion).*

And later, right up to the present day, one can see that Israel treats the United States as its vassal. He tells them which countries and which weapons they can sell. Israel violates the terms of the treaty, according to which the US is transferring weapons to it, and when they suspend the next deliveries, it *breaks the* treaty in anger ; the frightened US is backing down. It came to the comic complaint of President Reagan (at the IX 1981 press conference) that Israel was putting too much pressure on US foreign policy.

When Israel was expelled from the International Atomic Energy Agency by the votes of the Arab countries (quite legally, since it refused to provide evidence that atomic energy was used only for peaceful purposes), the United States left this Agency with it. The State Department said that the same would be the reaction of the United States if Israel were tried to be expelled from any other specialized UN agency. Finally, when there was a danger that the countries of the Third World would be able to achieve Israel's exclusion from the UN, the United States announced that then they would also withdraw from this organization. It seems that the United States has lost its independence in relation to Israel.

During his second term in office, Clinton tried to achieve a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. As an expression of his dissatisfaction with Israel's intransigent position, he did not invite the Israeli prime minister, who was in the United States, to the White House. The secretary from his office, Levinskaya, immediately appeared and began to talk about their connection, and with a lot of dirty details. On this occasion, they have

already begun to deploy the "impeachment" procedure (moreover, the president was accused not of his actions, but of the fact that at first he denied them). Here, apparently, Clinton realized in whose hands the power was. On the day the Senate decided to begin the procedure - December 12, 1998 - Clinton flew to Israel with his wife and family (including the dog). Moreover, the Israeli prime minister even claimed that he did not invite Clinton, but he himself insisted on the trip. After a series of humiliating public confessions, Clinton was forgiven, and the "impeachment" did not take place. In Israel, the radical trend prevailed. In September 2000, Ariel Sharon visited the Arab shrine of Al-Haram. In Arab circles, Sharon is nicknamed "the Lebanese butcher": he was the minister of war when the massacre took place in the Arab refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila and was removed from the government under the influence of outrage at the massacre - including in Israel. The appearance of Sharon near the Arab shrine was an obvious provocation, and it was so furnished, he was guarded by several thousand police officers. This gave a new impetus to the "intifada", the situation began to deteriorate rapidly, Sharon himself became prime minister and now (late 2001) we have a full-scale Arab-Israeli war. did not take place. In Israel, a radical trend prevailed. In September 2000, Ariel Sharon visited the Arab shrine of Al-Haram. In Arab circles, Sharon is nicknamed "the Lebanese butcher": he was the minister of war when the massacre took place in the Arab refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila and was removed from the government under the influence of outrage at the massacre - including in Israel. The appearance of Sharon near the Arab shrine was an obvious provocation, and it was so furnished, he was guarded by several thousand police officers. This gave a new impetus to the "intifada", the situation began to deteriorate rapidly, Sharon himself became prime minister and now (late 2001) we have a full-scale Arab-Israeli war. it was guarded by several thousand policemen. This gave a new impetus to the "intifada", the situation began to deteriorate rapidly, Sharon himself became prime minister and now (late 2001) we have a full-scale Arab-Israeli war.

Who do the Jews in the United States consider themselves to be? According to sociologists, 9/10 of them prefer to integrate into American society and are not supporters of Zionism. However, 4/5 believe that Washington's support for Israel is in the interests of the United States. In 1988 Jerry Tobin said:

*The State of Israel is now central to the definition of Jewish identity*

Of course, this is the same Jewish influence not only in the United States, but throughout the Western world. For example, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the West experienced a severe crisis. Mainly, it was student unrest - students were taking over universities. But also the unrest of blacks in the United States. The term "revolution" was on everyone's lips: the leaders of the movement claimed that 5 revolutions were taking place - the economic one, the overthrow of capitalism; national, secession of several southern states from the United States; political, the destruction of a repressive democratic system; sexual, destruction of the bourgeois family; psychedelic, combining the culture of sharing drugs and dancing to rock music (together this was to destroy the bourgeois individuality). And again, as in the Russian revolution of 1917, as in the German revolutionary years 1918-1923, as in the Hungarian Revolution of 1918 - there were a disproportionate number of Jews among the leaders: Kon Bendit, Jerry Rubin, Allen Ginsberg. The ideological leaders of this movement came from the philosophical "Frankfurt School", were followers of both Marx and Freud - and almost without exception Jews: Adorno ("after Auschwitz, poetry is impossible"), Marcuse, Horkheimer, Fromm.

A striking example is the fate of historians collectively known as "revisionists". What they have in common is that they seek to revise the standard views of the history of World War II that are generally accepted in the West. Some of them argue that the figure of 6 million Jews who died at the hands of the Nazi authorities is very exaggerated. Others argue that the Germans in the concentration camps did not use gas chambers. I personally do not really understand what drives them, as I said in Ch. 12. But whatever the motives of the "revisionists" are, it is not they that are striking, but the answer that these researchers have met. The modern German historian is very careful about this:

*However, it remains very regrettable that the main rule of science: "listen to the other side" is so completely lost in the recognized literature.*

Indeed, the "revisionists" are not answered, if they are mentioned, then only as "neo-Nazis" or "right-wing radicals", but they are constantly persecuted. A number of these authors were sentenced to imprisonment: in Canada, Germany, France, Switzerland. Others were sentenced to heavy fines or dismissed from their jobs without the right to retire (that is, doomed to a miserable existence). At the same time, no one accused them of doing anything other than writing books that argued against statements deemed "untouchable." This is the result of the centuries-old "struggle for freedom of speech" in the West! Now it is no longer possible to go to prison for the statement that the earth moves around the sun, but it is quite possible for a book containing arguments about the number of victims of the "Catastrophe", about how

I must say that although the consciousness of the average American is manipulated and controllable like a good car, they still firmly hold on to their "first amendment", which proclaims freedom of speech, and such courts are still impossible in the United States. But the verdict of the court is not the only misfortune that can befall people! For example, the American "revisionists" created a whole institute: the "Institute for

Historical Research" - and several years ago the building of the institute caught fire and the library was destroyed.

D. Duke writes in his book:

*When some of my friends in the patriotic movement coined (...) the term Zionist Occupation Government or SOP, I thought the name was a bit exaggerated, but after a lot of thought and research, I realized that this is the most appropriate description of sad cases in Washington in the field of foreign and domestic policy.*

The facts that we have cited indicate that the same is the case in the entire Western world and not only "in the sphere of foreign and domestic policy", but also in religion, political and social views, and in general throughout life.

## REFERENCES

Shahak I. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Reed D. Cit. in Ch. 1.

P. Sudoplatov Cit. in Ch. 13.

Goldmann N. Cit. in Ch. 3.

Weizmann Ch. Cit. in Ch. ten.

Cohn H. Cit. Ch. 12.

"Encyclopaedia Judaica". Jerusalem. 1972.

"B'nai B'rith Magazine". March. 1938.

"Declaration on the attitude towards non-Christian religions". II Vatican Council. Constitutions, decrees, declarations. Brussels. 1992.

Laurentin R. (abbe). L'Eglise et les juifs a Vatican II. 1967.

Katz J. Cit. in Ch. 4.

"The Russian Idea and the Jews". Digest of articles. M. 1994.

"Brief Jewish Encyclopedia". T.4. Article "Cinema".

Nitoburg E. Jews in modern America. M. 1998.

Who's Who in American Jewry. N.-Y. 1927.

Korn D. Wer ist wer im Judentum. Munchen. 1996.

Komey D. Who is who in the history of the Jews. London - Moscow. 1974, 1995.

Time magazine. Nov. 25 1974.

Findley P. They dare to speak out. N.-Y. 1985.

"Brief Jewish Encyclopedia". T.4. Article "Cinema".

Nolte E. Cit. in Ch. 12.

Cohen R. "No Jews in This Cabinet". The Washington Post, Jan. 16.2001.



## Chapter 15. In the second revolution in Russia.

*(late 1980s-early 1990s).*

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, a coup took place in our country, no less radical than the revolution of 1917. The political system and economic structure of the country changed. The country fell apart. All types of production have decreased by 2 times or more. Wars broke out between the newly formed states. As a result of these wars, a general drop in living standards and a widespread sense of hopelessness, the population has decreased by many millions, and the birth rate in Russia has become lower than it was in the last war.

This coup is usually called "perestroika" - a crafty term first invented to hide the nature of the changes taking place (or perhaps - their own lack of understanding of what will come of it all. Say, these are not reforms, but just perestroika). Such a coup has every right to be called a revolution. For brevity, I will call it the Revolution of the 1990s (although some fatal shifts began somewhat earlier).

So, Russia has gone through the second revolution in one century. What was the Jewish involvement *in it* ? First of all, it is striking that when the first shifts began, power was completely in the hands of the Russian people (in a purely ethnic sense). I remember, from those times, one solemn meeting of the Academy of Sciences, where the entire Gorbachev Politburo appeared. It was clearly visible to me and amazed me - what all Russian faces! Indeed, among them were not even that large number of Ukrainians who appeared under Brezhnev. With the exception of Shevardnadze and Aliyev, who appeared there temporarily, they were Great Russians. Not to mention the fact that there was not one Jew. Probably, there were some advisers, secretaries, employees of the Central Committee. But it was not the advisers who chose the Politburo, but the members of the Politburo appointed them!

And in order to more clearly assess what happened, let's step over in a few years and fast forward to a time when the main trends have already formed and won. In 1996, an American newspaper in Russian, Novoye Russkoe Slovo, appeared as a final article on the issue of interest to us. It must be said that the newspaper focuses on the community of Jews who came from Russia. This fact is not concealed by the newspaper - this is indicated, for example, by the advertisements published there about weddings, funerals, meetings, etc. It is to this circle of readers of the newspaper that the article addresses itself. It is called "Jewish Happiness", and its author, Leonid Radzikhovsky, is a publicist from Russia. The article is timed to coincide with an important event - the founding congress of the Russian Jewish Congress, which became part of the World Jewish Congress.

*Jews today make up a huge part of the Russian elite - artistic, intellectual (this, however, has always been during the last century), as well as political and commercial.*

*Politicians: Zhirinovsky, Yavlinsky, Chubais, former foreign minister Kozyrev and new minister of the same affairs Primakov, minister of economy Yasin, presidential aides Lifitsits and Satarov, governor of Nizhny Novgorod Nemtsov, first deputy prime minister of the Moscow government Resin, etc., and etc. With some stretch, Gaidar can also be included in this series ...*

*Jews also make up a huge part of the country's early capitalist elite. Almost all of the largest banks in Moscow are headed by Jews. Stolichny Bank - Alexander Smolensky, Most-Bank - Vladimir Gusinsky, Menatep - Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Russian Credit - Vitaly Malkin, Alfa-Bank - Petr Aven and Mikhail Fridman ... the same Vladimir Resin - the king of Moscow construction, as well as the notorious singer Joseph Kobzon, constantly accused of having links with the mafia, Boris Berezovsky and others.*

Two years later, the same issue was raised in an article published by the Moscow-based large-circulation newspaper Argumenty i Fakty. The author is the writer E. Topol, who began writing in the USSR, then left for America (his books, it seems, are of the detective genre - I myself have not read). The article is called

*"Love Russia, Boris Abramovich!"*

and as a subtitle: "An open letter to Berezovsky, Gusinsky, Smolensky, Khodorkovsky and other oligarchs."

The "Open Letter" is written broadly: it also expresses a view of the world mission of the Jews and recommendations for action in modern Russia. But now I will single out only the author's assessment of the current situation in Russia. He described it in a conversation with Berezovsky - "in an old mansion, restored with a New Russian scale and luxury ..."

Here's what the author said:

*Boris Abramovich ... There is, as you know, the "Dolls" program on television. There are dolls of Yeltsin, Yastrzhembsky, Chernomyrdin, Kulikov and others. But the main puppeteer is behind the screen, and his surname is Shenderovich. And in life there is the Russian government - Yeltsin, Kiriyyenko, Fedorov, Stepashin. But the main puppeteer has a long Jewish surname - Berezovsko-Gusinsko-Smolensko-Khodorkovsky and so on. That is, for the first time in a thousand years since the settlement of Jews in Russia, we received real power in this country.*

This is the picture of the current situation that the author draws. And she, as can be seen from the continuation of the dialogue, does not meet with objections from Berezovsky. Further, interesting points of view are also expressed, so we will continue the quote. The author says:

- I want to ask you point blank: how are you going to use it (power over Russia, as mentioned above - I.Sh.)? What are you going to do with this country? Drop it into the chaos of poverty and war, or raise it out of the mud? And do you understand that such a chance occurs once in a thousand years? And do you feel responsible to **our** (emphasis in the original - I.Sh.) people for your actions?

- You know ... - B.A. found it difficult to answer. - We, of course, see that financial power has ended up in Jewish hands, but from the point of view of historical responsibility, we have never looked at this ...

- And you never discussed this topic in your narrow circle?

- No.

Skipping Berezovsky's arguments about the reasons for the failure of Russian bankers, we will continue to quote the author's thought:

- Well, since it so happened that we have all the financial power, and the government consists of half-breeds Kiriyenko and Chubais, do you feel the full extent of the risk to which you expose our people in the event of Russia's collapse into the abyss? Anti-Semitic riots can turn into a new Holocaust.

- This is out of the question - said B.A. - Do you know what is the percentage of anti-Semitism in Russia now? Only eight percent! This is scientifically proven!

But the author does not agree with such an optimistic position and makes another argument:

*You know, when in Germany all German money ended up in the hands of Jewish bankers who thought only about increasing their wealth and power, Hitler appeared there, and it ended in the Holocaust.*

Here's another piece of evidence coming from the same circles. In 1997, a delegation of the leading bankers of Russia visited Israel: Aven, Berezovsky, Gusinsky, Malkin, Khait (almost exactly according to the list given in Radzikhovsky's article). They gave a collective interview to Israeli television. The cassette with the recording got to Russia and went from hand to hand here. Here are excerpts:

*A colossal, unprecedented redistribution of property took place. After 1991, 75% of the property that was in the hands of the state passed into private hands.*

Berezovsky.

*Such profits and such incomes, as in Russia, were not found anywhere else.*

Chait.

*50% of the capital belongs to Jewish business.*

Malkin.

The speakers also reveal the ways in which this coup was accomplished. Sometimes very lyrical:

*We started with little things ...*

and then:

*go, go, go, go ...*

Gusinsky.

But sometimes more specifically:

*You could move right, left, forward, backward.*

Malkin.

*This period was accompanied by general gullibility.*

Malkin.

*For two years no taxes were paid at all.*

Chait.

*It is now possible to redistribute billions of wealth.*

Berezovsky.

*It was nobody's!*

Berezovsky.

*It depended on the official's painting alone whether it would pass to you.*

Berezovsky.

There are arguments of a more general nature:

*If you help the authorities, then you earn moral authority. And this integrated opinion of big business influences personnel appointments.*

Malkin.

Host's question:

*Have you tried to influence the elections?*

Answer:

*They tried (with a big smile) and they did.*

Gusinsky.

Further - similar ideas:

*Investing in the media is not a business, but the protection of one's own (and not only one's) interests.*

Berezovsky.

In 1996, in connection with the upcoming elections, a letter from Russian entrepreneurs was published, where the main lines of Russia's future policy were indicated with an imperious voice. The letter was signed by eleven "entrepreneurs" and among them - Berezovsky, Smolensky, Khodorkovsky, Fridman. The letter states:

*... it is necessary to clearly distinguish between constructive politics and political speculation on a national theme.*

*We are all Russians.*

*We cannot engage in exhausting and fruitless pedagogy.*

*... domestic entrepreneurs have the necessary resources and will to influence politicians who are too unprincipled and too uncompromising.*

In a word, it was the voice of the new government.

In the book by V. Toporov, cited earlier, the question of the role of Jews in "perestroika" is raised:

*Jews (both those who feel that they are, and those who only regard themselves and their loved ones as inevitable victims of the coming oppression and repression) have made, for the most part, the capitalist, "democratic", pro-Yeltsin choice, willy-nilly, and more precisely, with great enthusiasm! - thus assuming part of the responsibility for national and socio-economic metamorphoses of the most pernicious nature. A huge part of the responsibility. And once again they showed national carelessness - if only because this responsibility will sooner or later be assigned only to them.*

During the 1996 presidential elections, a meeting of the Jewish community took place in the House of Cinema in support of Yeltsin. "Jewish newspaper" told about him under the headline: "Jews make their choice." Israeli cultural figures sent a letter to the "Jewish newspaper" with an appeal to "oppose the restoration." The same tendency is shown by the fact that 20 million Russian residents of the USSR who found themselves outside the borders of Russia did not receive the right to participate in the elections. But on the other hand, in Israel, polling stations were created specifically for immigrants from Russia. D. Furman, discussing the same issue in the language of numbers, the results of "sociological polls", writes (based on polls back in 1991):

*13.2% of Russians and 52.5% of Jews agreed that the West has created the best possible society and we need to follow the West.*

The author (without giving percentages here) asserts that Jews, in comparison with Russians, "do not show any particular desire to become businessmen."

*However, when it comes not about themselves, but about children, 18.6% of Russians and 30% of Jews choose the profession of a businessman.*

*22.1% of Russians and 30% of Jews agreed that the market is the most efficient form of economy, which must be reached as soon as possible, despite all the costs.*

*The percentage of those who agreed that "Russia should protect the interests of Russians in other former Soviet republics by any means, including the use of military force and changing borders" is two times lower among Jews than among Russians. In the statement: "Russia should not interfere in the internal affairs of*

*other independent states, even if the rights of Russians are violated there" - the ratio is even 1 to 4.*

The author formulates his own conclusions from the data of the given survey:

*Everywhere, all over the world, the role of Jews in progressive and revolutionary movements has always been completely out of proportion to their share in the population. In the history of Russia (...) revolutionary ideologies enjoyed particular success in the Jewish environment, and the role of Jews in our revolution was especially great. Is this activist strategy emerging now, during our second, anti-communist revolution? Naturally manifests itself ...*

In this case, the following pattern is indicated. During the "first revolutionary cycle" -

*Most of the politically active Jews sided with the revolution (...), simultaneously establishing a totalitarian system (...).  
In my opinion, in a very relaxed form (...) we see the same logic in relation to the majority of Jews in 1989-1993.*

The author explains this for one reason: the fear of "anti-Semitism", although, as he emphasizes, it is more about "fear" than about some real factor in life.

Back in 1994, V. Gusinsky, already mentioned (for example, in a quote from the article "Jewish Happiness") as a representative of the "early capitalist elite of Russia," speaking on Radio Liberty, said:

*We financed the entire political spectrum, which does not take an extremely radical fascist or nationalist position ... This is our country and we cannot allow the fascists to come here.*

Since "fascists and nationalists" in these circles means those who are trying to talk about Russian interests or at least the natural interests of the state (this is confirmed by a huge number of examples), then, in the sense of the above, all the rest receive support from the "early capitalist elite", a huge part of which according to the testimony of the same article cited above, "are Jews."

Sociologist R. Ryvkina, in a book dedicated specifically to the position of Jews in Russia after "perestroika", writes:

*the Jewish intelligentsia is again one of the most active groups of reformers - bankers, leaders of new public organizations, press workers, etc.*

Although, unfortunately, the author does not provide any specific data here, some explanation of this phenomenon is offered:

*... that Jews are competitive for occupying places in the new and more complex forms of the economy - such as finance, foreign economic relations, the securities market, the computer market, etc.*

(It would be interesting to know exactly from a *sociologist* what "competitiveness" means: hereditary abilities, better social status, etc.?).

And with such a significant impact on life, the attitude of Jews to Russia can hardly be called sympathy. So, R. Ryvkina cites the data of a survey among Jews on the topic: "In what period of Russian history would you prefer to live?" Most of the respondents answered: "I would rather not live in Russia at all." And already much less - under Gorbachev, under Brezhnev, etc.

There are many similar examples. But the conclusion is already clear. Just as in 1917 "Jewry" as a whole supported the revolution, so in the revolution of the 1990s. it turned out to be on the side of "perestroika" and supported the direction of life that gave this concept its present meaning. Of course, not all of the "democrats" were Jews (although the number of them and those whom Radzikhovsky refers to the "Jewish sphere" was very large and conspicuous there). But in the opposite camp of "patriots" - there were almost no Jews.

Toporov also speaks of this in another connection:

*The second Jewish revolution (like the first - in 1917) threatens to turn into a tragedy - both for the whole country and for the triumphant victory of the Jews.*

How did this great upheaval come about? It began with appeals tinged with communist rhetoric: "acceleration", "more socialism" ... And it ended (just a few years later) with the property of the richest state in the world leaving his hands (now it owns only 10% of the country's wealth) ... Where did the rest go? Sold out? But the state is poor, it cannot support the army, public education, medicine, and often it is late in paying pensions. So - in private hands, according to the recipe that Berezovsky described to Israeli radio: "There is an opportunity to redistribute wealth worth billions. It was nobody's! It depended on the official's signature alone whether it would pass to you." And by what means was the "official's signature" obtained?

Why did the authorities let go of all this: both wealth and the country? Of course, several factors were intertwined in such a crisis.

First of all, it is a change in communist society, which somehow degenerated almost instantly. And especially - its top layer. The impulse to struggle for power, solidarity and the ability to make sacrifices for the sake of conquering and retaining power has completely disappeared. These properties prevailed in the Leninist environment (they all risked their own heads). Stalin's entourage still remembered this. But later people began to rule the country, who thought that they had power "by itself." But the sacrifices that must be made for her sake were perceived as something external and optional. First of

all, unconditional submission, "monolithic unity" ensured by "blood tribute" - periodic arrests and executions. And, secondly, the annoying wealth of the country. It was in their power - but only "by office." It was impossible to formally pass on one's free-standing position to the children - one had to go for tricks. And with the collapse of a career, everything was lost in general. There was a tantalizing feeling that the wealth was "mine and not mine." And thoughts - how to make him yours simply, even if you give up (partially) from power. Such a central figure of this coup as Gaidar admits that its essence can be expressed in the words "money for power."

But as a second factor, it should be noted that the powerful force of Jewry has now fallen on the opposite side of the scale.

Given the "divorce" of Jewry and the communist system, which is mentioned in Ch. 13, and the "restructuring" proceeded. These few years, 1988-1991, remain hidden in some kind of fog to this day. Major decisions were made behind the scenes. Who decided to hand over the entire sphere of influence of the USSR ("socialist camp") to the West? This was not discussed, despite the appearance of an emerging democracy, and the participants are still keeping quiet about it. The permission to export oil (or its products) abroad and sell there at prices incommensurate with domestic ones in the USSR opened the way for the plunder of the country. Who gave it, under what pressure? After all, people who grew up working in the field of economics were in power - they could not help but understand what they were doing. Not to mention the decision to "dissolve" the USSR - without thinking about the borders, about the people living behind them.

But even behind this fog, some realities can be discerned. This entire economic and political revolution was carried out quickly - in 2-3 years. It was important that the bulk of the people did not have time to realize what was happening: that their savings would disappear, pensions would be reduced like shagreen skin, that teachers and engineers would turn into "shuttle traders", and officers would be fired. One of their main organizers called the entire system of the then reforms "an operation carried out under anesthesia, without the consent of the patient."

The role of this "anesthesia" was played by the media. I will cite Radio Liberty as a vivid example. Her broadcasts began (maybe they are starting now?) With the announcement that she is funded by the US Congress. After the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the US Congress discussed the question of whether to close the radio station "in connection with the end of the Cold War", i.e. there was no doubt that it was created as a weapon of the Cold War. And after the beginning of "perestroika" jamming stopped and the radio station could be listened to anywhere in the USSR, 24 hours a day. And she interfered in our life, was an instrument of a certain policy. As a principled thesis, it was proclaimed that the goal of "perestroika" is "a mutation of the Russian national spirit." The viciousness of Russian history and Russian culture was constantly explained. The roughest abuse was poured out on Russian writers: Astafiev, Belov, Rasputin - the terms "obscurantist" or "enraged" were of the most restrained. And separatism of any kind was promoted: Baltic, Ukrainian, even Siberian.



Who were the people who prepared this material? I came across a list of the leading programs (editors) of the era of the beginning of "perestroika". Of the 20 people, at least half are Jewish surnames: Roitman, Levin, Henkin, etc. When the radio station was established, there were many "second wave" emigrants working there. Then a group of emigrants from the era of allowing emigration from the USSR, heading instead of Israel to Europe, raised a fuss, accusing these Russian employees of "anti-Semitism." They secured the transfer of Russian employees to secondary positions and took their places. Then a few more Jewish surnames were added to the list of leading workers: Khenkina, Tolts, Matusevich and disappeared: Krasovsky (Russian) and Garcia (Italian). By the end of the 80s, according to M.V. Nazarov, who worked there, 4 or 3 of the 23 heads of the Russian editorial office were Russians. Later, the same group of employees declared the program according to Solzhenitsyn's book "anti-Semitic", since it said that Stolypin's killer Bogrov was a Jew. The editor had to make excuses, to prove that he himself was a Jew ... But all this was no longer a phenomenon isolated from Russia, the editorial board of Svoboda was intertwined with Soviet and Russian media. Many surnames that were called on "Svoboda" later appeared with us: Mark Deutsch, Vadim Belotserkovsky, Savik Shuster ... the editorial staff of "Svoboda" was intertwined with the Soviet and Russian media. Many surnames that were called on "Svoboda" later appeared with us: Mark Deutsch, Vadim Belotserkovsky, Savik Shuster ... the editorial staff of "Svoboda" was intertwined with the Soviet and Russian media. Many surnames that were called on "Svoboda" later appeared with us: Mark Deutsch, Vadim Belotserkovsky, Savik Shuster ...

Later, television became an even greater force. "Privatization" took place there as well: most of them left the government, and as a result, Jews became the heads of three (out of 6) central television channels. People call it "kosher television" or "Tel Avidenie". The most striking example of such a channel is the NTV channel. Its owner, Gusinsky, became simultaneously the chairman of the Russian Jewish Congress, the owner of the Segodnya newspaper and the Ekho Moskvyy radio station - he is usually called the "media tycoon." The NTV channel has long played a special role.

For example, in the first Chechen campaign, all television was hostile to the Russian troops and inspired sympathy for Dudayev's troops. But on NTV this was especially noticeable - there were constant programs from Dudayev's Chechnya. The introduction of troops into Chechnya was declared both unconstitutional and violating human rights. But such objections did not arise when in 1993 the Russian parliament was shot from tanks.

The channel was invariably hostile to the alliance of Russia with Belarus and to the President of Belarus - Lukashenko (even more than the rest of the television).

Obviously painful for the Russian consciousness were the pornographic publications that filled the Russian media at that time (and still do). Painful, since historically the Russian consciousness repulsed these topics. Since the inception of written literature, we have had nothing similar to either the love lyrics of the minstrels or Tristan and Isolde. All love motives in ancient Russian literature seem to be reduced to "The Cry of

Yaroslavna". Such a breakdown of national stereotypes was undoubtedly one of the factors in the destruction of national consciousness. And then the channel was ahead - with a permanent program on this topic.

A striking episode was the showing on this channel in 1997 of the film "The Last Temptation of Christ". I have seen a cassette of this film before. He struck me as disgusting: there are, for example, bed scenes with the participation of Mary Magdalene and Christ (even if interpreted as "visions of the crucified" ...). They replied to numerous protests: "No one can forbid us to show what we want." This, as it turned out, is quite true. But the question is more interesting - *why* did they need to show such a film? Because they can't show *everything* films, some people choose. And unfortunately the answer is pretty clear. At first, the film was supposed to be shown on Orthodox Easter. That is, it meant a deliberate insult to the religious feelings of the Orthodox. There was an official protest from the Patriarch - who else but he has the right to speak on behalf of the Orthodox? But even more broadly - all Russian culture and history is based on Orthodoxy. After all, saying goodbye to those killed in the Kulikovo field, Dmitry Donskoy said:

*You laid down your heads for the holy churches, for the Russian land and for the Christian faith.*

These categories merged. So this action of NTV was directed against all Russians. And despite the fact that the owner of the channel occupies such a high position in the official Jewish hierarchy that the main director of the channel is Fayfman. It would seem that we have gone far from the Middle Ages, when a wild crowd accused the Jews of blasphemous actions towards Christianity. Why artificially re-create the ground for such feelings?

Now it is believed that the channel is being harassed and this even violates "freedom of speech in Russia." But this oppression boiled down to the fact that Gusinsky lives somewhere abroad, and the employees of NTV were divided into two parts and now broadcast on two channels.

But back to the beginning of "perestroika". At that time, an ideological struggle was in full swing in the media. On the one hand, there is a struggle against "Stalinism" or the "command system". It was considered very brave, although then it was no longer a threat. As it is seen in retrospect, the direct enemy of the "democratic press" was then the state, although it was weakened, but stood in the way of "privatization" (although, perhaps, there were no clear plans). But, on the other hand, there was some kind of spiritual connection of all these journalists with the era of the 1920s, with "commissars in dusty helmets," as they wrote. Therefore, 1937 was declared a "battle line" - they wrote about its horrors with some kind of voluptuousness, and the whole previous era was defended almost by throwing themselves under tanks (figuratively, of course). As they wrote then: "It's the twenties. Not from the beginning, but from the end." And they defended them: "Why is it necessary to equate Stalin's criminality and immorality with

the hopelessness of revolutionaries?" That, it turns out, is how the Cheka should be understood!

In this atmosphere, Rybakov's highly publicized novel "Children of the Arbat" appeared - just about the plight of 34-38. children of the communist elite who settled on the Arbat (hence the name). The novel, now completely forgotten, was then used as a lever to turn the mass consciousness, widely supported by the usual method: "the truth told for the first time, hushed up". It also reflects the topic of interest to us - Jewish participation in the ongoing process. The question is immediately posed radically. For example, the author, Anatoly Naumovich Rybakov, describes how two heroes - one Boris Soloveichik, the other Sasha (apparently a half-breed) collide with a person, in the terminology of the 1920s. - "from the former" (yes, just a former high-class chef), Anton Stepanovich. They talk about returning home from exile, where they were.

*Home? - Anton Stepanovich looked at Boris with hatred. - Where is he, home? In your Berdichev? (...)*

*Well, scratch out of here, your mother through seven coffins into the dead eye! - said Sasha*

*No! - Boris got up, went to the door, put on the hook.*

*What are you guys doing? - Anton Stepanovich muttered uneasily. - I'm just a joke.*

*Last time I was joking, bitch, - Sasha smiled.*

*Boris leaned on Anton Stepanovich, pressed his head against the wall.*

*- Guys, let me go, - Anton Stepanovich wheezed, rolling out trashy whitish eyes.*

*- Do not leave it to the end, Borya, to my share, - said Sasha.*

*That puffy face was disgusting to him! Carrion!*

*I decided to scoff at them. Gad! Flaw! (...)*

The old man's words, no dispute, were boorish. But the reaction was symbolic, quite in the spirit of the 1918 law on anti-Semitism - "outlaw."

No sooner had there been a buzz about Children of the Arbat than a new sensation appeared: Grossman's story "Everything flows." Grossman was one of the most prominent propagandists of the communist era, dating back to the Stalinist era, on the same scale as Ehrenburg. The Jewish theme also played a role in his life. For example, the first story he published "In the city of Berdichev" reflected it very vividly. And the story "Treblinka Hell" was even disseminated at the Nuremberg trials. On the other hand, he signed a letter to Stalin demanding the most severe punishment for the "doctors-murderers", although the "trial of doctors" was generally perceived by Jews as a manifestation of "state anti-Semitism." The story "Everything flows" was written in the early 60s, finished shortly before the death of the author (1964), was kept secret and became known first in samizdat. With the victory of Perestroika, it was officially published and, together with Grossman's novel Life and Fate, was introduced by the media into the general consciousness as a new revelation, the lifting of prohibitions. The story is truly amazing. It very clearly sets out a new understanding of Russian history, in fact even of Russia (the author speaks of the "Russian soul") as a manifestation of the

principle of "eternal slavery." Moreover, this no longer refers to a certain period ("Stalinism") or a social stratum - the author sees the implementation of such a principle throughout history ("thousand-year slave") and even in the Russian soul ("slave") and in general - "retort of slavery" ... it was officially published and, together with Grossman's novel Life and Fate, was introduced by the media into the general consciousness as a new revelation, the "lifting of prohibitions." The story is truly amazing. It very clearly sets out a new understanding of Russian history, in fact even of Russia (the author speaks of the "Russian soul") as a manifestation of the principle of "eternal slavery." Moreover, this no longer refers to a certain period ("Stalinism") or a social stratum - the author sees the implementation of such a principle throughout history ("thousand-year slave") and even in the Russian soul ("slave") and in general - "retort of slavery" ... it was officially published and, together with Grossman's novel Life and Fate, was introduced by the media into the general consciousness as a new revelation, the "lifting of prohibitions." The story is truly amazing. It very clearly sets out a new understanding of Russian history, in fact even of Russia (the author speaks of the "Russian soul") as a manifestation of the principle of "eternal slavery." Moreover, this no longer refers to a certain period ("Stalinism") or a social stratum - the author sees the implementation of such a principle throughout history ("thousand-year slave") and even in the Russian soul ("slave") and in general - "retort of slavery" ... The story is truly amazing. It very clearly sets out a new understanding of Russian history, in fact even of Russia (the author speaks of the "Russian soul") as a manifestation of the principle of "eternal slavery." Moreover, this no longer refers to a certain period ("Stalinism") or a social stratum - the author sees the implementation of such a principle throughout history ("thousand-year slave") and even in the Russian soul ("slave") and in general - "retort of slavery" ... The story is truly amazing. It very clearly sets out a new understanding of Russian history, in fact even of Russia (the author speaks of the "Russian soul") as a manifestation of the principle of "eternal slavery." Moreover, this no longer refers to a certain period ("Stalinism") or a social stratum - the author sees the implementation of such a principle throughout history ("thousand-year slave") and even in the Russian soul ("slave") and in general - "retort of slavery" ...

In a sense, this story expressed the quintessence of one mood prevalent in those years. The desire to quickly implement the reforms of that time was accompanied by the fear that this would be impeded by some force, which was generally perceived as "Russian nationalism." The suppression of the dangerous "Russian nationalism" was also served by the concept of "the Russian soul - an eternal slave" and the term "imperial ambitions", which was popular in those years. At one time, the vague image of the "enemy of perestroika" - "Russian nationalism" was concretized in the image of the "Memory" society. On this occasion, a campaign was launched around the world, quite comparable in scale to the campaign around the Dreyfus Cause or the Beilis Cause. Communist newspapers also wrote about the threat posed by the Memory Society. and American. Even the European Parliament passed a decree demanding that this society be banned. Now 11-12 years have passed since then and it is clear that "Memory" has not shown itself in any way, has not influenced our life in any way. That is, this entire global campaign reflected, as they say now, "virtual reality". But even more broadly, the whole world was agitated by fears that "Russian nationalism" and "anti-Semitism" would

threaten it from Russia. The Washington Post published an article "Glasnost Makes Anti-Semitic Voices Heard." The Soviet academician (now deceased) Gol'dansky published in the same newspaper an article "Anti-Semitism: The Return of the Russian Nightmare" (Russian translation was published in Soviet Russia), where he informs the American reader that "some" As the only example, he cites a scuffle that took place in the House of Writers in Moscow. This "incident in the Central House of Writers" then went around the entire democratic press, although all of its victims were - someone's shattered glasses. (More precisely, there was one human sacrifice, but precisely from the side of "Memory": Smirnov-Ostashvili was arrested, sentenced to several years and "found hanged in a cell" a few months before his release). And at the same time, Russians were really killed during pogroms in Dushanbe or Tuva. But a group of democratic public figures excitedly demanded the restoration of a "law against anti-Semitism" (as in 1918). As the only example, he cites a scuffle that took place in the House of Writers in Moscow. This "incident in the Central House of Writers" then went around the entire democratic press, although all of its victims were - someone's shattered glasses. (More precisely, there was one human sacrifice, but precisely from the side of "Memory": Smirnov-Ostashvili was arrested, sentenced to several years and "found hanged in a cell" a few months before his release). And at the same time, Russians were really killed during pogroms in Dushanbe or Tuva. But a group of democratic public figures excitedly demanded the restoration of a "law against anti-Semitism" (as in 1918). although all his victims were - someone's broken glasses. (More precisely, there was one human sacrifice, but precisely from the side of "Memory": Smirnov-Ostashvili was arrested, sentenced to several years and "found hanged in a cell" a few months before his release). And at the same time, Russians were really killed during pogroms in Dushanbe or Tuva. But a group of democratic public figures excitedly demanded the restoration of a "law against anti-Semitism" (as in 1918). although all his victims were - someone's broken glasses. (More precisely, there was one human sacrifice, but precisely from the side of "Memory": Smirnov-Ostashvili was arrested, sentenced to several years and "found hanged in a cell" a few months before his release). And at the same time, Russians were really killed during pogroms in Dushanbe or Tuva. But a group of democratic public figures excitedly demanded the restoration of a "law against anti-Semitism" (as in 1918). And at the same time, Russians were really killed during pogroms in Dushanbe or Tuva. But a group of democratic public figures excitedly demanded the restoration of a "law against anti-Semitism" (as in 1918).

There was a very complex connection between these two "phobias" - "Russian nationalism" and "anti-Semitism". When demonstrations took place in Chisinau with monstrous slogans: "Let's drown the Russians in Jewish blood" - the democratic press was not worried. When units of SS veterans marched in the Baltic states at parades, this did not bother her either. Apparently, it was not at all about reflecting the real interests or feelings of the bulk of Jews, especially those three million "in the Jewish sphere" whom Radzikhovsky counted. On the contrary, their interests were grossly violated for the sake of striving for power and wealth of a small stratum - I recall the

relationship between "patricians" and "plebeians" in the kagala, about which Brafman speaks. In particular, the heated rumors about the upcoming Jewish pogroms caused an increase in emigration from precisely this wide circle of people who had many connections with our life. They painfully broke these ties, left, driven by fear, "saving the children." It is now clear that there was no real "threat of pogroms" at all. I remember that in those years a rabbi from Jerusalem who came to Moscow wished to meet me. They also talked about fear of pogroms. Smiling skeptically, he said that he did not undertake to assess the validity of these fears. But, he assured, the feeling of fear is very real. In those years, a rabbi from Jerusalem who came to Moscow wished to meet me. They also talked about fear of pogroms. Smiling skeptically, he said that he did not undertake to assess the validity of these fears. But, he assured, the feeling of fear is very real. In those years, a rabbi from Jerusalem who came to Moscow wished to meet me. They also talked about fear of pogroms. Smiling skeptically, he said that he did not undertake to assess the validity of these fears. But, he assured, the feeling of fear is very real.

Of course, this fear-mongering took the form of a search for "anti-Semitism", which continues to this day. Thus, R. Ryvkina asserts "anti-Semitism" as an eternal feature of the peoples of Russia:

*it became clear that anti-Semitism in Russia (we are talking about anti-Semitism of political groups) is invariant to all its political regimes: it persists regardless of what kind of power is established in the country*

(that is, Lenin, Gorbachev, Yeltsin are in power - is it "anti-Semitism" anyway?).

Although what this terrible term means is still unclear. The researcher herself distinguishes *four* types of it. Which of the four do they mean when someone is accused of this?

Yes, and the book contains data from a survey among Jews about "anti-Semitism", and to the question of whether it exists, the answer was almost unanimously positive, but what the respondent himself or a member of his family faced with it in a specific form - twice less answered positively number. And when the cited examples of "anti-Jewish propaganda" are cited, we meet: "television's interest in the nationality of active politicians", "national flavor in criminal cases, for example, of Yakubovsky or Weinberg," and even "attitude towards Borovoy."

When the conversation with Berezovsky, which Topol talks about, took place, the first, when asked about a possible "Holocaust" in Russia, replied: "This is out of the question! (...) This is scientifically verified!" I think that the leaders knew this about themselves all the time. Let thousands of lives have been crippled. But on the other hand, the image of the Russians - pogromists, of Russia - fraught with pogroms was strengthened throughout the world. And the West was ready to support the government, which is restraining such a country with new reforms, waving its hand at all the canons of democracy.

Probably, such a vilification of the Russians had other goals (or was a breakthrough of irrational emotions). It continued all the time - and continues to this day. That - television shows a pig, about which they say that this is Russia with its incurable complexes; then they wash it in a basin, kill it, and distribute pieces of meat to the laughing participants in the performance. That - the newspaper bypasses a photograph where a man looks under the tail of a dummy cow. Signed: a journey into the depths of Russia. This is from the show of the gallery of Marat Guelman. (I first saw this work in the Itogi magazine. I have preserved it in the reproduction of the Zavtra newspaper). Then the statement that Russians have been sick for many centuries, "who walks by themselves," or that Russians have a place in a prison cell, and moreover, "at the bucket." Reasoning about

Here's a recent one. On the Internet for 2001 - a message about the new exhibition of the artist Maxim Kantor:

*We are talking about Russia, which Kantor interprets as a kind of global black hole: an ugly blot on the world map, a self-absorbing wasteland. Inhabited by many inhabitants: crooked, gnarled, hiding faces in folds of fat ...*

Etc. - one and a half full pages of such text. In the end, the author of the review sympathizes with the artist denouncing "bow-legged bastards. They still won't understand anything."

20 years ago I wrote the work "Russophobia" for samizdat, where, according to articles by now forgotten authors in samizdat or in the new emigration, as an archaeologist for the bones, I restored this strange phenomenon of disgust and hatred for Russians, which gripped people who spent most of their life in Russia ... And for more than 10 years now, I have seen with horror how this demonic monster is clanging its teeth from the pages of newspapers, from TV screens. From propaganda, the spirit of Russophobia spilled over into foreign policy. With some voluptuousness, our government repulsed those parts of the Russian people and other peoples who tried not to break away from Russia, were ready to pay in blood for it: in Crimea, Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia. The beginning was laid under the diligent Minister of Foreign Affairs Kozyrev (later - a member of the Presidium of the Russian Jewish Congress),

What is the position of Jewry in Russia now? There is a substantial book about this by A. Sevastyanov "What the Jews want from us". It is on this issue that the book has collected a large amount of factual material, leading the author to an integral point of view (although some of the book's judgments seem to me less justified, dictated by emotions or some other experiences).

First of all, the author notes that the era when the main goal of organized Jewry was considered to be departure to Israel or the United States is over. I myself remember how more than 19 years ago an "Open Letter" was addressed to me, in which the author lyrically remarked that "the time has come for our peoples to part." And that was a common feeling in Jewish circles.

Now the situation has changed dramatically. "Parting" came for the author who wrote to me (he settled in the USA), but not for "our peoples." Sevastyanov reports on a secret agreement between the United States, Israel and the USSR (back in 1989), according to which the departure of Jews to the United States was sharply reduced. This is stated in the "Memorandum on the Emigration of Soviet Jews" drawn up by the International Committee "For Open Borders", which is contained in a collection that is inaccessible to me. With the departure to Israel, the situation is confirmed by more generally available sources. "Jewish Newspaper" has repeatedly reported on the growing negative attitude towards the Jews who came to Israel from the USSR-Russia. Thus, the director of the prime minister's office, Lieberman, said:

*I have said more than once that our society is discriminating against immigrants from the former Soviet Union. A situation has developed when every Russian-speaking businessman is often viewed as a member of the Russian mafia, any pretty woman who dresses well is considered a prostitute, every second engineer is said to have bought his diploma, and every third repatriate is suspected of being a KGB agent.*

More specifically, a public opinion poll published in Jewish Newspaper states:

*34% of Israelis say: "Aliya from the countries of the former USSR scares me."  
63% of the country's citizens are categorically against organizing new waves of mass emigration from the CIS.  
80% of the public: "New immigrants are competing with the Israelis in the wage market" (...)  
associations regarding new immigrants from the former USSR: parasites (25%), drug addicts / prostitutes (19%).  
The Israeli police decided to rename the department for combating especially grave crimes into the department for combating the Russian mafia and organized crime.*

I remember that 15-20 years ago I was amazed that any request to be summoned to Israel (even on arguments like: "I had a now deceased Jewish aunt") was immediately satisfied. Why did the Israeli authorities need the emigration of such people from the USSR? But now new rules have been introduced for calling even tourists from the CIS countries. Moreover, according to the "Jewish Newspaper", in recent days new demands of religious parties have been published in the press concerning, among other things, such changes that can prevent the emigration of non-Jews - members of Jewish families to Israel.

And emigration, naturally, is on the decline. R. Ryvkina writes:

*Since 1992, the emigrant boom (....) began to fade into the past.*

She reports that the average annual number of those who received permission to emigrate fell by half.



On the other hand, Sevastyanov cites a number of facts about the systematic strengthening of Jewish communities in Europe. So, according to "Jewish newspaper":

*Under an agreement with the Jewish community, after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Bonn allowed a large number of Jewish refugees from the former Soviet Union to settle in Germany. These migrants receive housing, financial assistance, and free German language courses. They can also, if they wish, obtain German citizenship (...),  
the Jewish population of Germany doubled to sixty thousand.*

And according to R. Ryvkina, after 1992, the overwhelming majority of emigrating Jews go to Germany (70-80 percent) and incomparably less to Israel and the United States.

About another country, according to the director of the CIS department of the Jewish Agency for Israel:

*The Jewish community of Hungary is, according to our estimates, from 80 to 150 thousand people (...). We teach them Hebrew, introduce them to the ancient and modern history of the Jewish people, organize Jewish camps, support Jewish schools, train Jewish teachers (...).  
There are dozens of Jewish organizations operating in Hungary, which include from 80 to 130 thousand Jews living in the country.*

Against this background, it becomes clear that the position of the Jewish community in Russia has changed. For example, the head of the Moscow bureau of the Jewish Agency says:

*There is an extreme approach that all Jews must return to Israel, there is also a much more moderate one (...).  
The Jewish people are very concerned about assimilation or, if you like, disappearance. This is one of the pressing problems. In its solution, Israel helps the diaspora itself more.*

The new goals of the Jewish Agency for Israel are formulated:

*strengthening the connection between the diaspora and Israel, developing Jewish education (...).*

The head of the Jewish Agency's Repatriation and Absorption Department assures that its staff:

*will do their best to ensure that in 1996 the repatriation of Jews remains at least at the same level,*

but expresses confidence that:

*every Jew, his children and grandchildren, even if they do not repatriate to Israel, will remain Jews.*

And at the same conference A.M. Mordukhovich:

*It's time to talk about specific actions. We lack communication. We must remember that this is our city - Moscow.*

The emigration of Jews from the USSR-Russia to Israel, which in the early 1990s amounted to 300 thousand people a year, fell to 60 thousand in 1996. But on the other hand, the Russian Jewish Congress (RJC), the Russian branch of the World Jewish Congress, was created. The author of the "Jewish Newspaper" formulated:

*The RJC has three main tasks. The first is to openly declare to the whole world that they are Jews and are ready to recognize themselves as part of the Jewish community. The second task is to gather the bulk of the Jewish population of Russia under the canopy of a united Jewish community. The third goal is to get wealthy Jews to take the trouble to help Jewish organizations.*

Another author in the same newspaper:

*RJK is, from my point of view, a transitional period in the formation of the Jewish community in Russia. The period of activity, based on enthusiasm and amateurism, has ended, and a period of large concrete programs has begun, a period of unification of Russian Jewry, intellectual, religious, industrial and financial.*

Having described a sharp turn in the mood of Russian Jewry - from a general enthusiasm for emigration to settling in Russia - Sevastyanov also gives an argument explaining the inevitability of such a turn. We have already cited the testimonies of Jewish authors about the wealth that ended up in the hands of Jewish "businessmen" as a result of "perestroika". And if in some cases this wealth was in the form of accounts in Western banks, in others it was of a different nature. For example, from an article in the Izvestia newspaper:

*The time has come to explain who Boris Berezovsky is and why his word in solving program issues (on the ORT television channel) is the last and often the only one. In the statutory documents, he appears as a member of the board of the United Bank and deputy chairman of the ORT board of directors. At the same time, Berezovsky is the head of JSC LogoVAZ, and although another person represents this commercial structure on the ORT Board of Directors, Boris Berezovsky actually owns 8% of United Bank shares and 8% of LogoVAZ shares in the authorized capital of Russian Public TV. That is, 16 percent, while the rest of the "private traders" - from 3 to 5.*

Or from the "Jewish newspaper":

*Leonid Reitman spoke in detail about how his business is developing and what scale it has reached:*

*"I own an entire block - an area of 17,000 square meters - in the Taganka metro area in Moscow," he says. I rent these houses and make a profit. The price of this property is growing every year. "*

And a number of other examples of such wealth that cannot be taken with you. Of the Jewish "oligarchs" mentioned above, in recent years some have been pushed aside (to one degree or another) from the fruits of "perestroika", but others have appeared: Abramovich, Mamut ..., so the picture remains the same.

And quite recently, "Komsomolskaya Pravda" reported a list of "the richest people in Russia" and the size of their fortunes (in billions of dollars):

Khodorkovsky	3.7
Abramovich	3.0
Friedman	2.2
Potinin	1.8
Bogdanov	1.6
Alekperov	1.4
Deripaska	1.1

(and the sum of the capitals of the first three is noticeably higher than that of the remaining four). But here only the "top" are listed, behind which the masses of "businessmen" of the middle and small level are hidden. Therefore, the conclusion of Sevastyanov seems to be well grounded and fair as well two years after the publication of his work. He formulates the "goal" (dominant tendency) of Jewry in Russia as "two-fold":

*the integration of Jews into Russian society and the Russian establishment while maintaining a full-fledged national identity.*

This integration is associated with a tremendous increase in the influence of Russian Jewry. The situation is becoming comparable to the one that was in Russia in the 1920s. It can be seen that there are tendencies to defend this influence as decisively as then. For example, I remember that the terrible execution in 1993 found me in Japan (at the invitation of the local mathematicians). Events fell like snow on their head. The TV showed a building that was being shot, burning, but what he was saying — in Japanese — was incomprehensible. American newspapers could be obtained, but they had no faith at all. The first Russian-language newspaper to finally appear was Moskovsky Komsomolets. And two judgments were cut into the memories:

*They wanted a Russian order, they will get it.*

Khinshtein.

*... I support it unambiguously. Russian fascism was walking before our eyes.*

Guzman.

And they are known in many statements of the same type: how the execution was correct, what pleasure this spectacle caused, that we should not stop there ...

Thanks to the deaf, unorganized resistance of the people, the law of 1918 has not yet been restored: "to put outside the law ...". But the appropriate mood is clearly there.

In a very excited article, a professor at Bar-Ilan University in Israel, Eliezer Voronel-Datsevich, writes:

*Today, many are convinced that Jews rule Russia. I do not think so. Russia is ruled by the most ordinary scum, whose nationality is not important in this case. Unfortunately, the scary figures that have surfaced have the corresponding surnames. But for me (...) it is about something else - about the ship that they captured.*

Toporov notes:

*It is not that a new state anti-Semitism is ripening in our country (which is not, that is not), but more and more favorable soil is being created for it. And it is created, first of all, by the Jews themselves - successful, untwisted (in modern jargon this means - advertised - I.Sh.), triumphant, - but abandoning any kind of reflection on the national (it is, in this case, mafia ) the nature of their success; moreover, prohibiting such reflection to all others (...). However, the attempt to achieve symmetry (partly undertaken in the previous lines) inevitably fails: the Jewophiles and the Jew-phobes still somehow balance each other, but the reaction of the Jews themselves to the discussion of a delicate and painful problem - the reaction is invariably inadequate - distorts the picture (...).*

The reaction is, in fact, mysterious. Perhaps there is a certain deep complex associated with medieval exterminations and reinforced by Hitler, who at the beginning of perestroika, with the onset of a weakening of power, caused irrational fears. But in more than 10 years it would be quite possible to understand their ephemerality (especially with a rational Jewish mind). And the same academician Goldansky, more than 10 years after the first article, wrote another (this time addressing not American, but Russian readers), where he repeated:

*At the end of the 20th century, the country most affected by the Nazis became the main focus of Nazi ideology ...*

This cannot be explained by irrational complexes. Yes, even then, in connection with the appearance of "Russophobia" in the press, I received such dramatic letters ... One person wrote that the reality of the impending pogroms could not be disputed and asked - what will I say "in this case"? Another (woman) asked: "How can you live in the world, Igor Rostislavovich, if the blood of innocents is on your conscience?" About 15 years have passed since then! Have any of them apologized? Can not hear. But let's continue with Toporov:

*.... This has become especially noticeable in recent years, when the obstacles of tacit state anti-Semitism fell, and it became possible to buy anything for money. Including the Hasidic holiday in the Kremlin. Including the airtime, and then the television itself. The insulting word "Tel Avidenie" did not appear out of nowhere.*

Indeed, the totalitarian uniformity of our media in this matter is shown at least by their reaction to the recent (April 2002) wave of protests that swept across Europe against the actions of the Israeli authorities in the ongoing Israeli-Arab war. Crowds on the streets of European cities burn the American and Israeli flags. Scientists are calling for a scientific and cultural boycott of Israel, signed by many hundreds of scientists. A number of scientists living in the United States objected.

The protest against Israeli actions in the occupied Arab territories was published by the Secretary General of Amnesty International Irena Khan. Amnesty International has opened a special website on the Internet dedicated to this problem.

In one of the most common American magazines - "Time" - the author of the article asks:

*Why do Americans and Europeans treat the situation in the Middle East so differently?*

and offers a predictable answer:

*First of all, because the shadow and shame of the Holocaust comes from the past and puts its cold hand on our modern understanding of the world.*

Of course, at the same time, Arab organizations are committing bloody terrorist acts in Israel. I am completely incompetent to judge the whole question, but there is no doubt that this is the most important "news". And at the same time, I personally have not met a single mention of this in our media, and none of those whom I asked heard anything either.

In the novel "1984" Orwell tells how people who showed political unreliability are deleted from history, called "nonpersons". And all these events that worry Europe are made "non-events" in our country.

## LITERATURE

- Radzikhovsky L. Jewish happiness. "New Russian Word". Jan 17 1996.
- E. Topol. Love Russia, Boris Abramovich! "Arguments and Facts". No. 38, 1998.
- "TVNZ". March 2, 2002.
- "Independent newspaper". 27.04.1996
- V. Toporov. Cit. in Ch. 13.
- Furman D. Mass consciousness of Russian Jews and anti-Semitism. "Free Thought". N9, 1996.
- Ryvkina R. Cit. in Ch. 13.
- Gaidar E. State and Evolution. M. 1995.
- Nazarov M. Radio Liberty in the Struggle for Peace. M. - Munich, 1992.
- On the Kulikovo field. M. 1980.
- Kuraev A. How they make an anti-Semite. M. 1998.
- Rybakov A. Children of the Arbat. M. 1988.
- Grossman V. Everything flows. October magazine. No. 6, 1989.
- "Washington Post". April 12, 1990.
- "Soviet Russia". 80, 7 Apr 1990.
- "Tomorrow". No. 46 (259), 1998.
- Akhiezer. A. Russia. Criticism of historical experience. 3 vol. M. 1991.
- Internet. <http://www.vesti.ru/2001/10/29/1004363106.html>
- Sevastyanov A. What the Jews want from us. M. 2000.
- "Independent newspaper". No. 209, November 10, 1998.
- Eliezer Voronel-Datsevich. Broken mirror. "Tomorrow", No. 34 (299).
- Elliot M. Children of the Holocaust. "Time", April 29, 2002.

## Chapter 16. Jewish talents.

The last chapters gave, perhaps, an idea of the fantastic growth of the influence of Jewry in the world. In just 200-300 years, from the inhabitants of settlements shackled by their kagals, the Jews turned into the most influential group of the modern world: into the masters of international finance, economy, and human souls (through the media). An almost unprecedented event in history. Actually, only one similar phenomenon occurs to me: the spread of Greek influence during the Hellenistic era, from the wars of Alexander the Great to the Roman conquest. Geographically, this process did not cover "the whole world", but, for that time, a comparable space: from western India in the East to Sicily and southern Italy in the West. And the whole process was then even faster: from the 4th to the 3rd centuries. BC The reasons for such an explosive spread of Greek influence are also clear: the Greeks carried with them a completely original, charming, attractive culture. Together with them, "Greek education" spread. So the immediate cause of Hellenism is pretty obvious: it lies in the extraordinary creativity that the Greeks possessed. Indeed, over several centuries they have created: and the basic concepts of natural science, science, which we still live; and Greek literature, from Homer to classical tragedy; and Greek sculpture; and architecture. In Greek society, democracy arose and reached its full flowering, with all its virtues and vices. So the immediate cause of Hellenism is pretty obvious: it lies in the extraordinary creativity that the Greeks possessed. Indeed, over several centuries they have created: and the basic concepts of natural science, science, which we still live; and Greek literature, from Homer to classical tragedy; and Greek sculpture; and architecture. In Greek society, democracy arose and reached its full flowering, with all its virtues and vices. So the immediate cause of Hellenism is pretty obvious: it lies in the extraordinary creativity that the Greeks possessed. Indeed, over several centuries they have created: and the basic concepts of natural science, science, which we still live; and Greek literature, from Homer to classical tragedy; and Greek sculpture; and architecture. In Greek society, democracy arose and reached its full flowering, with all its virtues and vices.

Are we witnessing a similar "Jewish Hellenism"? Some external differences are striking. For example, in the Hellenistic era, Greek influence was associated with the spread of the Greek language, but now we do not observe any penetration of the Hebrew language into the non-Jewish environment. But still, maybe the fundamental reason is similar? Perhaps the main reason for Jewish influence lies in the great creative potential of Jews, in Jewish talent? This point of view is often expressed. For example, Rozanov says that the poet Minsky told him: "Of course, Jews are more capable than Russians and want to sit in the front rows of armchairs." The names of Jews - leading figures of modern science: Marx, Freud, Einstein are given. And modern music started with Schoenberg and Alban Berg. The first conservatory in the world was created by Mendelssohn-Bartholdi. Here, in Russia, the first conservatories were organized: in St. Petersburg - by Anton Rubinstein and in Moscow - by Nikolai Rubinstein. In literature, new directions came from Heine and Kafka. And there are many similar examples.

This argument should be parsed. And above all, start with the most famous figures: Marx, Freud, Einstein. Once upon a time there was even such an anecdote (probably arising in the Jewish environment) - "about the three great Jews."

The influence of Marx on human minds was very strong, but short-lived. It began after his death, and over the past decades it has plummeted - and, apparently, for a long time or forever. I still remember the time when the teachings of Marx in our country were introduced by the power of power - but in the West, almost all of the intelligentsia in one form or another accepted it. One could express his disagreement, but with many reservations ("I, of course, do not deny the depth of these ideas and the solidity of their scientific justification ..."). Only rare people who have already received recognition before risked expressing "unconditional disagreement" (examples will be given later). But I was repeatedly convinced that both in the socialist camp and outside it, adherence to Marxism was not based on an acquaintance with the works of Marx, especially the political economy. Marx's influence had a completely different source. In a speech delivered at his funeral, Engels said: "Marx was above all a revolutionary." That is, the main stimulus of his life was the overthrow, destruction of the then existing way of life. This point of view is argued in detail in the book of Sombart. He proves that as the realization of this impulse, its consequence - the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the proletarian revolution, and the class struggle, and surplus value, and political economic work arose. Yes, this is clearly seen from the correspondence between Marx and Engels. It shows that the need for theoretical substantiation, formalized as a scientific study, followed from the logic of the revolutionary struggle. Thus, as early as October 1844, Engels wrote to Marx: "Marx was, above all, a revolutionary." That is, the main stimulus of his life was the overthrow, destruction of the then existing way of life. This point of view is argued in detail in the book of Sombart. He proves that as the realization of this impulse, its consequence - the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the proletarian revolution, and the class struggle, and surplus value, and political economic work arose. Yes, this is clearly seen from the correspondence between Marx and Engels. It shows that the need for theoretical substantiation, formalized as a scientific study, followed from the logic of the revolutionary struggle. Thus, as early as October 1844, Engels wrote to Marx: "Marx was, above all, a revolutionary." That is, the main stimulus of his life was the overthrow, destruction of the then existing way of life. This point of view is argued in detail in the book of Sombart. He proves that as the realization of this impulse, its consequence - the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the proletarian revolution, and the class struggle, and surplus value, and political economic work arose. Yes, this is clearly seen from the correspondence between Marx and Engels. It shows that the need for theoretical substantiation, formalized as a scientific study, followed from the logic of the revolutionary struggle. Thus, as early as October



1844, Engels wrote to Marx: This point of view is argued in detail in the book of Sombart. He proves that as the realization of this impulse, its consequence - the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the proletarian revolution, and the class struggle, and surplus value, and political economic work arose. Yes, this is clearly seen from the correspondence between Marx and Engels. It shows that the need for theoretical substantiation, formalized as a scientific study, followed from the logic of the revolutionary struggle. Thus, as early as October 1844, Engels wrote to Marx: that the need for a theoretical foundation, formalized as a scientific study, followed from the logic of the revolutionary struggle. Thus, as early as October 1844, Engels wrote to Marx: that the need for a theoretical foundation, formalized as a scientific study, followed from the logic of the revolutionary struggle. Thus, as early as October 1844, Engels wrote to Marx:

*Our people (...) are very active, but there is a lack of proper support. Until our principles are developed - in two or three books - and are not logically and historically deduced from the previous worldview and previous history as their necessary continuation, the whole work will remain half-hearted ...*

On November 26, 1847, he called on Marx to "punish Louis Blanc":

*... show him in practice how much higher we are (...). The theoretical side, unfortunately, is still our only strength, but for these champions of "social science," "the law of sufficient production," and so on. it makes a big difference.*

Finally, on January 31, 1869:

*... in order to maintain, in spite of Vogt and company, our prestige with the public, we need to come up with scientific works (...). Be at least once less conscientious in your own work; she's still too good for this lousy audience. The main thing is that the thing is written and published, and the donkeys will not notice the weaknesses that catch your eye.*

And only in the 1860s did Marx begin to create this theoretical foundation of revolutionary activity (after a preliminary sketch in 1859 - "Critics of Political Economy"). He starts working on Capital. And on June 18, 1862 he writes to Engels:

*I am greatly enlarging this volume, since German dogs measure the value of a book by its volume.*

That is, Marx and Engels felt very rightly that the revolutionary work of that time would receive a powerful impetus if it was given a "scientific foundation." At that time, the reference to the authority of science was simply mesmerizing. This was also felt by the predecessors of Marx and Engels - Saint-Simon and Fourier, but this "scientific basis" was created very naively. For example, Saint-Simon claimed that he discovered in society a "law of gravitation" similar to Newton's; Fourier spoke of patterns similar to "ellipse, hyperbola and parabola." But neither one nor the other could say what these

"laws" are. Marx imitated the scientific style much better. This pseudoscience made an amazing impression, as can be seen from the memoirs of the then revolutionaries (for example, Vera Zasulich).

Marx strove to complete his political and economic writings, since they were supposed to form the scientific foundation for future revolutionary activities. And it seemed that the wave of the revolution was growing. The Paris Commune caused a new rise in the hopes of Marx and Engels. But even here (as before, during the revolution of 1848 in Germany), the hopes were justified. In the First International, Bakunin proved to be more successful than Marx and Engels in the sphere of underground intrigues. The main impetus for theoretical research by Marx disappeared - and he left them. *Capital* was published in 1867 and until his death in 1883 Marx did not return to these problems in print. He became interested in the problems of founding differential calculus. Unfortunately for Marx, these of his "mathematical manuscripts" were popularized at one time in the USSR and became widely known.

Ideologically, however, Marx was a very standard representative of the nineteenth century. For example, he unconditionally assimilated the then dominant concept of progress only by combining it with the then existing concept of the class struggle. There are very few new ideas in his analysis of the genesis of capitalism, the research of M. Weber or W. Sombart is much brighter and more original.

Wide popularity came to Marx after his death, when his followers led the leadership of the German workers' movement, created earlier by Lassalle. Engels invariably emphasized his second place after Marx ("he always played the second violin under Marx"), but on the other hand, among the living he turned out to be the first guardian and interpreter of the ideas of a genius who had already left us. Then, at the end of the 19th century, the worldwide glory of Marx began.

But the success of Marxism has always been determined by its connection with the revolution. Marxism was successful as a "prophecy", that is, the prediction of an event, the occurrence of which the concept itself contributes. And this very prophecy turned out to be refuted by history. The socialist revolution, as a matter of selection, did not take place in the most capitalistically developed countries, and the "dictatorship of the proletariat" was established in countries with 80% or 90% peasants. And in conclusion, the society built by the Marxist party turned out to be unstable: it disintegrated not under the influence of external conflict or natural disasters, but under the influence of its own forces of decay. All this caused a landslide drop in interest in Marxism. For example, now in Russia, even supporters of communism, at their meetings and demonstrations, they never wear portraits of Marx. And curious: interest in Marx simply "faded". This did not have the character of rejection of any scientific theory, rejection based on its criticism, discussion of a number of its weak points. Now it became clear that both the success of Marxism and the decline of interest in it are purely ideological phenomena. They have nothing to do with science.

It seems to me that Freud is even farther from science than Marx. There are many arguments on this topic, but I will limit myself to one specific example. This is an excerpt from Freud's article "Dissatisfaction with Culture", which is considered one of his most profound, ideological works. It comes to how man subdued fire, and Freud writes (in a long footnote):

*Psychoanalytic material, for all its incompleteness and ambiguity, allows one to express at least one - sounding fantastic - assumption regarding the origin of this enormous human achievement. For primitive man, it was as if it were usual, when faced with a fire, to extinguish it with a stream of his urine, finding in this childish pleasure. Existing legends did not allow doubting the original phallic interpretation of the flames soaring upward. Putting out the fire by pouring urine - remember that the giant children later resorted to this - Gulliver in the land of the Lilliputians and Gargantua in Rabelais - was thus like a sexual act with a man, enjoying male potency in homosexual competition. The one who was the first to refuse this pleasure, who spared the fire, he was able to take him with him and put him at his service. He tamed the fire of nature by drowning out the fire of his own sexual arousal. This great victory of civilization became, as it were, a reward for the fact that man overcame his instinct. In the future, the woman was, as it were, chosen as the keeper of the fire captured and fixed in the hearth, because she, in her anatomical structure, could not succumb to the temptation of such pleasures.*

It would seem that the person who wrote this has no idea what scientific research is. All this is not only unsubstantiated, but does not make sense at all: why, having given up the pleasure of letting urine into the fire, a person immediately takes possession of the fire? - it makes no sense to ask such questions. (Or why is Gulliver a giant child?) And this is not a separate oddity, an accidental eclipse of the mind - such reasoning is full of Freud's works. A person who thinks in this way can be anyone - a maniac, a science fiction writer, a preacher, a myth-maker, but he has nothing to do with science. And meanwhile - recently was Freud's jubilee and the whole world extolled him as the greatest scientist of our (i.e. XX) century!

It seemed to me for a long time that when they repeat the statement that Marx and Freud are great scientists, we are talking about direct suggestion, which is as clearly contrary to the facts as "the new dress of the king." But I probably would not have dared to publicly express such a heretical judgment if I had not met with the thoughts of von Hayek:

*If our civilization survives, which is possible only if it realizes its mistakes, I think future generations will look at our time as an era of superstition, mainly associated with the names of Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud.*

He emphasizes that we are talking about "superstition in the most literal sense of the word ...".

Moreover, the same idea was expressed by Karl Jaspers and, obviously, Hayek did not know this statement by Jaspers (about 20 years earlier). While von Hayek is considered one of the leading economists of the 20th century, a Nobel laureate in economics, and Jaspers, a very famous philosopher, first made a name for himself as a psychiatrist (and mainly criticizes Freud from a professional point of view). So Hayek is certainly competent in discussing Marx, and Jaspers - Freud.

As for Einstein, the situation here, it seems to me, is more subtle. There can hardly be any doubt that he was an exceptionally talented physicist. But in the general opinion it has been assigned some other role. He is considered as a model, a symbol of scientific genius. When they want to praise someone, they say "straight Einstein". His face appears as a symbol when you need to somehow symbolize science, even human intelligence. His detailed biography speaks of the "canonization of Einstein". In 1919, the Berliner Illustrierte newspaper published his portrait and wrote: "Albert Einstein is the new giant of world history." The famous historian Toynbee writes: "The achievements of natural science of the 20th century are embodied for us in the personality of Einstein" (although he hardly delved into these achievements himself). Such a place in the public consciousness seems to me unjustified, fabricated. And the "collective unconscious" sensed the situation: now a cartoon image of Einstein is advertising beer on television. I think that with Newton or Heisenberg it would have been simply impossible.

Physics developed very rapidly in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, aroused intense interest and attracted a lot of forces. Einstein, it seems to me, also belongs to a whole galaxy (at least ten) of the most talented physicists, such as Rutherford, Lorentz, Poincaré, Planck, Bohr, Heisenberg, Schrödinger, Dirac and others. Moreover, some of them are deeper and more versatile than it. The main merit of Einstein is usually recognized as the creation of the "theory of relativity". It was created in two stages: "special theory of relativity" (STR) and "general theory of relativity" (GR). The main work of Einstein on SRT dates back to 1905. Almost simultaneously (2 weeks earlier), the work of Poincaré appeared on the same topic - an amazing thinker: first of all, a mathematician, an outstanding physicist and philosopher at the same time. So, in the extreme case, Einstein could lay claim to the creation of SRT - simultaneously and independently of Poincaré. But the situation is more complicated. The theory of relativity became so famous precisely because it required the abandonment of some seemingly obvious concepts - for example, the simultaneity of two events. But Poincaré, back in 1898, wrote the work "Measurement of Time", in which he proved the logical groundlessness of this concept. The content of this work was included in Poincaré's philosophical book Science and Hypothesis, published in 1902, which became very popular. Einstein never refers to these studies of Poincaré and it seems that they remained unknown to him. But the memoirs of contemporaries show that they studied them together with Einstein and were strongly influenced by them. In the recall,

One of the most famous conclusions of SRT is the "equivalence of mass and energy", in a sense, realized in an atomic explosion. This principle was first established by the Austrian physicist Hasenerl, a fellow student of Schrödinger's who died at the front

during the First World War. The commentary on Schrödinger's Writings on Hasenerl states:

*In 1904, considering radiation in a closed cavity, he formulated for this case the equivalence of mass and energy. (Einstein, who formulated it in its most general form, did not know Hasenerl's work.)*

As for general relativity, Einstein's work on deriving its main equation, as has now been found out, took place during the period of intensive correspondence between Einstein and the greatest mathematician of that time (after Poincaré's death) - Hilbert. Moreover, Einstein sought to find the simplest form of this equation simply from the fact that it had to satisfy certain conditions, and Hilbert mathematically derived it from a certain general principle. At the same time, there are no references to Hilbert's contribution in Einstein's works. However, his later letter to Hilbert of a "conciliatory" character has survived.

One can imagine a hermit scientist who has little interest in other people's research, reaches a lot on his own and is not very interested in priority problems (there have been such cases). But Einstein was not like that. His most detailed biography speaks of his reports in Germany, France, Japan, where he promoted his ideas:

*In May-June 1925, they (the Einsteins) set off to travel again, this time visiting Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. Wherever they went, from Singapore to Montevideo, the local Jewish communities gave them a warm welcome.*

Priority disputes run throughout the history of science. And often later it can be seen that for some time a one-sided point of view dominates, exaggerating the role of one scientist at the expense of others. But the general pattern here is this: the bias in favor of one person can prevail to the greater extent and continue to dominate the longer, the more social support this person has. Such social support can be realized as a powerful scientific school or even as broader intellectual or political currents. Such a role in the fate of Einstein was undoubtedly played by the fact that he belonged to several trends that are extremely influential in the world. First of all, the Jewish national movement. Since 1919, he was closely associated with one of the most prominent figures of Zionism, Blumenfeld, who "

This, it seems to me, explains the "icon-painting" appearance created by Einstein, although he was undoubtedly one of the most talented physicists of his generation. His tireless 15-year study of the theory of relativity was (along with the works of other authors) of enormous importance for the creation of this theory (especially after the death of Poincaré). He also performed other physical works, for example, the discovery of the photoelectric effect, for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1929. But Einstein's inability to understand the principles of quantum mechanics Bohr-Heisenberg, and his completely fruitless activity throughout his subsequent life after 1920 is difficult combine with the familiar face of a super-brilliant physicist.

If we talk about other names, then Heine, for example, wrote charming poems - it was not for nothing that Lermontov and Tyutchev translated him. But in this he does not follow the current of German romanticism. And what he won a very special place is the bilious satire, the "feuilleton style" introduced into poetry. Some kind of fiction, alien to poetry itself. Like Kafka's - a description of eerie, disgusting situations - like a premonition of modern "horror films", but so far with weaker technical means. Or the invention of the twelve-tone system in music by Schoenberg. The creation of conservatories, first in Leipzig, then in St. Petersburg and Moscow - by Mendelssohn-Bartholdi and the Rubinstein brothers - undoubtedly had a strong influence on the development of music. But it was more of a social, organizational action. And the late composer Sviridov,

Jews are really very different among the "talents of the second and third hand", "artisans of culture", and their role in culture increased as the role of the masses increased: mass publications, journalism (newspaper, radio and television), when science was not moved individual scientists, and scientific institutes, scientific progress began to be determined by capital investments, and the number of scientists is expressed in millions.

It is difficult to say what was the cause and what was the effect here: did the Jews adapt the culture to their style of thinking or began to masses into it when it acquired a style close to them. Most likely, both processes were intertwined.

As a rule, the large participation of Jews in any area of culture is determined not at all by their creative abilities in this area, but by some other, much more complex reasons. If, for example, Jews constitute the majority of the members of the Union of Soviet Composers, then one cannot yet conclude from this about their outstanding talent as composers. 874 members (only in the RSFSR) cannot consist of bright talents alone - only a few of them will be born per generation. The Composers' Union is a highly bureaucratic organization, a typical organ of the "ideological sector". Among its members, the overwhelming majority has more than average creative abilities and admission to it is determined by many factors, most of which have nothing to do with music. In the pre-war period (before World War II), the situation in this area was probably similar (with an even greater predominance of Jews). And whose names have remained?: Shostakovich, Prokofiev, Myaskovsky ... The following observations are given in the posthumously published notes of the composer Sviridov:

*The Composers' Union has long ceased to be an organization dealing with creative problems. The meaning that was invested in the business by its organizers has been lost.*

*It (the union) turned into a feeding trough for ordinary composers, into a gigantic organization of self-propaganda and creative self-affirmation for its energetic functionary leaders. They keep entire staffs of people with them working for the glory of their patrons.*

*Their obedient minions sit in all institutions, manage almost (all) the musical life of the country: state orders (huge sums of money), concert organizations; own publishing house, music departments of Radio and TV, own - and general! - seal. There is a danger of turning state organizations into branches of the Composers' Union, run by the enterprising, irresponsible functionaries of the Composers' Union through obedient people they have put in positions of responsibility in Soviet institutions.*

*In their hands is propaganda abroad, where they spend several months a year, presenting our culture and art with their sometimes mediocre music.*

*This degenerated organization is run by clever businessmen who demand exorbitant honors for themselves with an enterprise. It smokes inordinate flattery, causing bewilderment and disgust in a person with (inaudible) taste.*

*Theaters, orchestras, government orders, own rest houses, creative houses, treatment. Millions of people's money for these hangers-on.*

*In their hands - the entire world enterprise (and Soviet too); education (conservatories and music schools), where they scientifically humiliate national culture, giving it the place of a "province"; music departments in newspapers and magazines and all special printing; Unions of Composers (in the Russian Federation as a whole); philharmonic society; criticism (almost 100%) - that is, public opinion. The music departments of the ministries are under the control of the Composers' Union. Radio and TV (here, however, not entirely), musical theaters, orchestras and their leaders (almost 100%).*

*All this is superbly, in a military-like manner, discipline is iron and unquestioning, order is absolute, ruthlessness is like in Sabra and Shatila.*

*They have been working in editorial offices for **decades**. These people are experienced and skillful, but their experience and skills are directed not for the good, but to the detriment of our culture.*

Here the data that accidentally fell into my hands about the national composition of the Union of Soviet Composers and the many years' observations of the outstanding composer about the work of this Union coincided. But there is no reason to suppose that such a situation took place only in music. But this applies only to the last, post-war period.

If we go a little deeper into the past of our country, then we will face grandiose processes that have changed its social structure. We have already referred to the book by Y. Larin (Lurie), dedicated to the situation of the Jews in the USSR. It says that before the revolution, 2,200 thousand Jews lived in small cities and towns of Russia, and now (i.e., in 1926) there are only 800 thousand of them left. The question is, to whose places did almost 1.5 million Jews move to the cities. ? First of all, literally - what houses, apartments did they move into? After all, there was no housing construction at all then, and it was possible to get an apartment only by removing or "compacting" its owner. And then even more widely - whose places in the party and Soviet apparatus, industry, science and culture they occupied (for in the countryside, obviously, did not go)? The same author also reports some of the results of this tremendous reshuffle.

*In Ukraine, 26% of all students were Jews, and in medical universities - 44.8%. In the RSFSR, Jews made up 11.4% of students (while before the revolution, with Poland, Lithuania, Moldova, Jews made up 2.4% of the population). In Moscow, Jews constituted 2.2% of the population in 1920, 5.6% in 1923, and 6.5% in 1926.*

But after all, their children also took the place of someone's children, maybe not even born. As a teenager, I made this observation. My parents came from the poorest and most innocent pre-revolutionary intelligentsia. They still have a small circle of acquaintances, mostly school friends. And so I noticed that they were either not married or had no children. Yes, and my parents had me - an only child. Then I remembered that at school I had never met children from Russian pre-revolutionary families of the intelligentsia. Of the friends I can remember, one had a father who was an electrician, the other lived with his mother, who was a cleaner ... I had school friends whose parents were doctors, engineers, lawyers ... But they were Jews. That is, according to my personal recollections, the Russian pre-revolutionary intelligentsia was dying out. And after that it was empty, "free place. Much later, already in the 1970s. one Jewish publicist summarized the situation as follows:

*By replacing the vacuum that formed after the disappearance of the Russian intelligentsia, the Jews themselves became this intelligentsia.*

Jews were not affected by the extermination of landowners and nobles. Moreover, they were not affected by the most terrible cataclysm of this era - collectivization and dispossession. For comparison: in the late 1920s, Jewish agricultural settlements were created in the Crimea and near Odessa. They were strictly voluntary, the settlers were supplied with cars and livestock free of charge, and were exempt from taxes. In 1923 the state budget allocated 5 million for these settlements, the American Jewish organization Joint - 20 million! And all in all, according to the plan, 26,000 families were to be settled, but this plan was not fulfilled ... The war was won with the blood of the peasantry, and "invalids - residents of rural areas" did not even receive a pension. In 1946, many rural areas were again visited by famine, but by this time, as we have heard, 98% of Jews were already living in cities.

Then everything went "by itself", almost without effort. I will give you one example from a later time. A Russian-language magazine published in Israel tells the following story.

*Elena Isaakovna Shchors, listed as a Russian by her passport, is in fact the granddaughter of the Hero of the Civil War Nikolai Shchors, the legendary commander known for the song "A bloody trail spreads over the thick grass." Shchors' wife at that unforgettable time was Fruma Rostova, whose real name I do not know. This iron Chekist Frum, crushing the counter-revolutionaries like bedbugs, in the city of Rostov entrusted to her for this purpose, managed to give birth to a daughter Valentina from N. Shchors, who, in turn, having grown up, married the physicist Isaak Khalatnikov, who is currently a corresponding member Academy of Sciences of the USSR (published in 1976; later -*



*academician). The history of his career is even more instructive, since, while living in the city of Kharkov, he was summoned by Academician Landau to study in his seminar. At the time, Landau, oppressed by a long list of Jewish surnames, forming the school of his students, came across the name of Khalatnikov, which gave him a reason to mistakenly think that he would dilute the school of theoretical physicists with at least one Russian person, which the party and the government had repeatedly asked him to do. One can imagine how Landau swore when he learned that this Kharkiv resident Khalatnikov was not Khalatnikov at all, but Isaak Markovich.*

With what amazing ease, with Odessa humor, the theme of "the iron Chekist, which crushed counter-revolutionaries like bedbugs," and the more modern theme, Landau's "long list of Jewish students" are presented here. After all, this is a heavy moral accusation: it's like hiring only your relatives.

I do not know how correctly the author describes the situation in the Landau school - rather, his article characterizes the direction of the journal that published it. However, in the statements of the students of another prominent theoretical physicist (and mathematician) of that time, Bogolyubov, one can feel the bitterness caused by the position of "outsiders" in relation to the already established Landau school. It all started with the competition of heads of schools on the basis of the theory of superfluidity of helium, which Bogolyubov reported to the Academy of Sciences in 1946, and by that time Landau had been studying for more than 5 years. Bogolyubov's disciple, D. Shirokov (later an academician) writes: "According to the recollections of the participants (...) of the meeting, Landau sharply criticized the speaker. sent an article to the press, where ad hoc (i.e. without justification - I. Sh.), A curve with an inflection was proposed for the excitation spectrum (...). The Landau curve follows from the formula of N.N. (Bogolyubov) under certain assumptions about the nature of the interaction between helium atoms - II. However, any reference to N.N. Landau's publication is not contained. "Another student of Bogolyubov, V.G. Soloviev, writes:" In the fall of 1953, NN Bogolyubov was elected an academician in the Department of Physical and Mathematical Sciences. At this time, the dominance of the Landau school was complete. Since the works of NN Bogolyubov, performed outside Landau's school, aroused great interest, it was emphasized in every possible way that he was not a theoretical physicist, but a mathematician. "In connection with the election of Bogolyubov an academician, I myself remember that the famous mathematician L.S. Pontryagin told me later that Landau (with whom they were then on friendly terms) told him: "What a pity, that you are not running, otherwise we would have elected you instead of Bogolyubov. "Moreover, the main achievements of Pontryagin then related to topology and Landau could not evaluate them in any way. Speaking about the early 1950s, the same V.G. Soloviev writes : "If the report is approved at the Landau seminar, then the publication or dissertation is approved. If a scientific direction did not receive support at the seminar, then it practically had no chances for development (...). The one who passed the theoretical minimum of Landau, which consisted of nine exams, was considered a full participant in the seminar. During each exam, which Landau personally took, it was necessary to solve three problems and answer additional questions (...). I

learned that some examinees knew the proposed problems in advance. I did not know a single one (...) and therefore considered (...) that, perhaps,

And the matter was clearly not limited to one school. I remember similar scientific schools and seminars in mathematics. And it was not limited to one country. On a global scale, this is how reputations were created, priority issues were resolved, famous prizes were handed out ...

But all these considerations do not touch, nevertheless, the very essence of the problem. It is now to discuss this core of the issue that I want to move on. It seems to me that it consists in the fact that the talent of the people, *in principle*, is not measured by the talent of its individual representatives.

When we talk, for example, about a person, we do not mean the ideal work of any of his organs, like the pancreas, but the activity that is characteristic of his human individuality, in old-fashioned terminology - the creation of his soul. And a talented people are recognized not by the number of their talented representatives, but by the ability to create their own, unique values for this people - the fruits of the people's soul: like Greek drama, Italian painting, German music, Russian literature, Persian poetry ... Sometimes it is a product of creativity several close peoples: for example, the modern physical and mathematical picture of the world was created by the Romano-Germanic peoples.

In this sense, the Jews as a people were deprived of creativity. Even in ancient Judea, all cultural activity was apparently completely suppressed by a single goal - the creation of an ethnocentric religion. And later, hardly anyone can indicate at least some product of the Jewish culture. One could try to explain this by the fact that the life of the Jews proceeded in dispersion - although this did not prevent them from preserving the consciousness of national unity, while among other peoples this consciousness is always associated with the existence of national culture. But the creation of a purely Jewish state of Israel did not change anything in this. The situation has become even more acute. It would seem that such bright Jewish talents are manifested in countries where Jews are interspersed in insignificant quantities, like uranium in the surrounding ore. If you put them together, just an atomic cultural explosion should have happened! But in reality it turned out - emptiness. Even in specific Jewish areas of activity. For example, almost all the best violinists in the world are Jews, but I have not heard of any who came out of Israel. The same applies to chess players. Israel (as a recognized state) has existed for more than half a century, and it has generated fewer talents than other small countries: Holland, Denmark, Norway. We saw in this review that the Jews made a great contribution to the development of certain currents of humanity. For example, in the development of capitalism in Western Europe. But capitalism was already taking shape - in Italy, France. The Jews participated only in giving it certain features: a financial and speculative direction. Or in the development of socialism in the 19th and 20th centuries. But socialism itself as a doctrine existed long before that, from Plato. The Jews, however, played an enormous role in transforming it into the basis of the revolutionary movement, in the victory of the socialist revolution and

the establishment of revolutionary power. In addition, the Jews, after the era of emancipation (in the 19th-20th centuries), participated in the cultural activities of many countries, along with representatives of the indigenous (as they say now, titular) peoples. For example, in the development of German literature and music, common European physics and mathematics, world finance, etc. And in my own specialty - mathematics - I know many names of Jewish talented, talented mathematicians, starting from the 19th century, in my life I met them myself. But they all operated in the cultural mathematical tradition that the Western European peoples had already created. It contains Japanese, Jews, Russians, Chinese, etc. were only successors. Yes, even such a vivid example as the genius cycle of songs by Shostakovich "From Jewish folk poetry." Apparently, there was a bright folklore of Jewish townships, it was even partially collected (as I heard, by Jewish musicians). But it took Shostakovich to turn it into world music.

I am able to point out only one creative act that is characteristic of the Jews as a people - this is the creation of themselves: a completely unique, unprecedented fusion of religion and nationality, implicated in the idea of being chosen. And the preservation and strengthening of this amazing phenomenon for more than two millennia. But these are not at all the fruits of culture that we are talking about in connection with the Greeks, Romans, Germans, Chinese, etc. In the same, more standard sense, Jews participate in the activities of *others*. peoples, within the framework of the culture already created by these peoples. Moreover, they make the development of some areas or areas more intensive. In my old work, Russophobia, I compared the role of Jews in the Russian revolution with the role of catalysts in chemical reactions. These are substances that accelerate a chemical reaction, although in their absence the reaction would still occur, but less actively.

Associated with this is a deeper, objective danger of too significant participation of Jews in the development of some area. They themselves need the bulk of the representatives of the people, in principle, creating a new culture. Without this (ie, for example, if the Jews become the majority, "dominate") cultural creativity itself dries up, and there is no room for Jews either. A situation similar to that which exists in the State of Israel ensues.

But now in the world there are just such tendencies. Sociologist Katz of the University of Jerusalem writes:

*The question arises as to who will become the intellectual elite of the post-industrial society - Jews or the population constituting the absolute ethnic majority in a particular country.*

The author draws attention to the fact that

*... while Israel should become the center and, moreover, the spiritual center of world Jewry ...*

and expresses doubt:

*It is unlikely that this ethnic majority would agree that 80 or 100 percent of Jews had a higher education, and the rest of the population lagged behind them many times, so that Jews would remain the leaders of leading scientific centers in those countries where they make up a negligible or relatively negligible percentage. ...*

"But this is how the picture looks today" - continues the author and gives a number of really striking examples: in the main technical institute of the United States - MIT - almost all leading scientific and administrative posts, including the post of President of the Institute, are occupied by Jews, President of the Royal Society of London (English Academy in Natural Sciences) is a Jew, Jews occupy leading positions in many universities in France and other Western countries.

Here you can see a certain concept of the nearest future of humanity, almost "Utopia": with the transition to a post-industrial society, the creators of culture are not individuals, not Galilees, Newtowns, Faradeys, not Rublevs or anonymous medieval icon painters and temple builders, but huge collectives - enterprises and scientific research institutes. The very concept of "culture" acquires a new meaning - it is mass, machine production, that "stamped culture" about which A. Bely wrote. And the leaders of this activity are the Jews, united by the world spiritual center - Israel. What is scary here is not even that the Jews usurp the role that the "ethnic majority" could play, but that this "Drowning" is too similar to the predictions of Zamyatin, Huxley and Orwell.

## LITERATURE

Sombart W. Der Proletarische Sozialismus ("Marxismus"). Jena. 1924. Bd. 12.

K. Marx, F. Engels Collected Works. M. 1934. (Correspondence: Comrades XXI-XXV.)

Freud Z. Dissatisfaction with culture. Favorites. T. 1. London 1969.

Hayek FA Laws, Legislation and Liberty. V. 3. Chicago. 1979.

Jaspers K. Vernunft und Widervernunft unseres Zeit. Munchen. 1956.

Pais A. Scientific activity and life of Albert Einstein. M. 1989.

Vizgin V. On the discovery of the equations of the gravitational field by Einstein and Hilbert. "Advances in Physical Sciences". No. 12, 2001.

E. Schrödinger. Selected Works on Quantum Mechanics. M. "Science". 1976.

Weizman Ch. Trial and Error. Cit. in chap. ten.

Sviridov G. B. Miscellaneous entries. The magazines "Our Contemporary" (2000, N 12) and "Moscow" (2000, November).

Khazanov B. "The Smell of Stars". Tel Aviv.

Suslov I. Last year's snow. The magazine "Time and We", Israel, N 4. 1976.

Bogolyubov N.N. Mathematician, mechanic, physicist. Dubna. 1994.

Zeev Katz. Cit. in chap. 13.

## Chapter 17. Discussion.

### 1. "What is a Jew".

Here we will try to formulate some conclusions from the previous, historical, chapters. These findings, of course, give a picture with a very large number of blank spots. The history of Jewry is too voluminous (if only in terms of the time it covers) to be covered in any clear formulations. And Dostoevsky also wrote:

*all times and dates have not yet come , despite the forty centuries that have passed, and the final word of mankind about this great tribe is still ahead.*

It seems to me that this idea is quite correct even now. Therefore, I set myself a very limited goal - to extract from the known historical facts several specific conclusions that would be useful in the future (I mean, first of all, Russians, but not only them) in order to develop my attitude to this mysterious phenomenon - Jewry. Or rather, to establish a relationship with him that would take into account our main historical goals.

And first of all, we can return to the question discussed at the beginning of the work: what kind of community constitutes Jewry? Recently, the influential in Jewish circles Rabbi Adin Steinsaltz devoted a special work to this issue. The title of this work: "What is a Jew" - we adopted it as the title of the section. Although the question itself is not new - a lot has been written about this, including by Jewish authors: what is Jewry? - a nation, a religion or a certain "spirit of Jewry"? As it turned out, this question is very delicate and I am not going to offer my answer to it - only to summarize some of the observations following from the previous historical review.

The above historical sketches allow us to note some of the constantly occurring traits that are associated with Jewry. So, in the book about "Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World" S. Ya. Lurie notes a special property of the Jewish people (in Antiquity):

*it, having neither its territory, nor its own language, and being scattered all over the world, nevertheless (....) remains a nation-state organism.*

Dostoevsky says:

*no, such an unusually strong and energetic people, such a people unparalleled in the world, could not exist without Status in statu (that is, without forming a state within a state - I.Sh.).*

And Yakov Klatskin writes about the "Jewish state system": "we saved it as a portable state, which in the diaspora creates for us an analogue of state autonomy", "a solid wall we created separated us from the people of the country, and behind the wall lived a Jewish state in miniature ". Russian religious philosopher of the 20th century. - O. S. Bulgakov says: "And the most mysterious of Israel's destinies is its unity." And another thinker of the same trend, V. Zenkovsky: "What is most striking in Jewry after the

dispersal is its unique and exceptional vitality as a national whole." "world Jewry (...) remains unified (...) in the internal imperatives of life, which determine a special fate, a special path of Jewry." These are all just different aspects of Gertz's observation of "

Naturally, the easiest way was to try to find an explanation using those categories that usually in history form human communities: religions and nations. For example, pre-revolutionary Russian legislation perceived Jews exclusively as a religious community ("persons of the Jewish faith"). This was also the point of view of the Jews during the period of enthusiasm for emancipation and assimilation: "we are just Germans of the Mosaic Law" (or the English, Russians, etc.). Now another point of view prevails: Jews are a nationality. Thus, Zionism in the era of Herzl and Weizmann was a purely secular national trend. For example, Weizmann said (after World War II, in connection with the creation of the state of Israel):

*While we will respect the beliefs of every person, we cannot turn the clock back, making religion the foundation of the state (...). Religion should not control the activities of the state.*

(True, reality turned out to be inconsistent with this declaration.)

The debate over whether Jews are a nation or united by religion has a more ancient history. He throws, for example, light on Marx's enigmatic early article On the Jewish Question. It contains a number of striking statements, for example:

*The chimerical nationality of a Jew is the nationality of a merchant, in general a money man.  
Money is the jealous god of Israel, in whose face there should be no other god.*

If these thoughts were published now, then Marx would immediately be branded as an anti-Semite.

Apparently, the explanation for this strange situation is related to the broader context of this article. It is the answer to two articles by Bruno Bauer on the same issue. In them, Bauer argues that the Jewish question is a religious question. The Christian state, he argues, is not based on the principle of equal rights. Jews must either fight against the very principles of the Christian state, or be content with the place (and a number of privileges) given to them. They want, however, while remaining Jews, to have the same rights as Christians, that is, they demand a special position for themselves. For Marx, however, the concept of basing history on religious principles was especially painful; he needed to reduce the whole situation to the economic relationship between Jews and Christians.

*As soon as society succeeds in abolishing the empirical essence of Jewry, huckstering and its preconditions, the Jew will become impossible ...*

(What was so convincingly verified in Russia after the 1917 revolution!)

Apparently, none of these points of view, that Jewry is a religion or a nation, makes the whole phenomenon more understandable. Everything that has been previously stated in this work leads, it seems to me, to the necessity that *connections* are required for understanding. both points of view: Jewry is a unique fusion of religion and nation. All the bewilderment stemmed from the fact that they tried to fit Jewry into one of the well-known series of historical phenomena. Or they said: this is a people, like the Greeks, Romans, Germans, French ... But it turned out - it doesn't look like it. Or that it is a religion: like ancient paganism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, Islam. And again it did not fit. The key is that this is a phenomenon without analogues in History: the only case of an ethnocentric religion and a nation held together by a religious feeling, and both components are connected by the idea of being chosen. This can be seen in such a fragment of modern Jewry as Israel. More than 80% of the population considers themselves atheists, and the rabbi determines the most important aspects of life: the form of marriage, recognition of citizenship, etc. Obviously,

There was no such intertwining, interpenetration of the nation and religion anywhere. The ancient Greeks believed that their gods were also the gods of the Trojans. According to Homer, the Trojans worshiped Zeus, Apollo, Aphrodite. When the Greeks came into contact with a wider range of peoples, they proceeded from the fact that they worship the same gods, only under different names. For example, Herodotus says: "The Egyptians worship Dionysus, whom they call Osiris." The so-called "world religions": Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, all the more, appeal to all of humanity. But if we recall such Talmudic sayings (quoted by Eisenmenger):

*... the peoples of the earth are not called people, since their souls come from an unclean spirit, while the Israelites are called people, whose souls come from the holy spirit of God.*

Rabbi Simon ben Jahai says:

*you are called people, but other nations are not called people, but beasts,*

then it becomes obvious that we are dealing with some kind of phenomenon of a completely different plan than well-known religious or national groups.

And so a very stable tradition was created. For example, the famous modern Jewish ideologist M. Gefter, recalling his youth, writes:

*... I was not a Jew then. Knew, but did not know. Perhaps he repulsed this knowledge, but still not out of fear! Rather, following the Mowgli complex.*

That is: the image of a *human child among beasts*, perfectly in the spirit of Rabbi Simon ben Jahai. Yes, and Nachum Goldman asks, what is the defense mechanism that has preserved the Jewry in all the persecutions? And he answers:



*This mechanism can be described in a few words: the Jews treated their persecutors as an inferior race.*

Moreover, Jewry is not a formal union of Jewish nationality and Judaism. What religious or national roots can we talk about, for example, in connection with the Jews who participated in the 1917 revolution: Trotsky, Zinoviev, etc.? So, Litvinov was a staunch supporter of Jewish assimilation and in the questionnaires he wrote himself as a Russian, Maxim Maksimovich, although from birth he was called Meer Genokh Movshevich Wallah.

S. Margolina, now living in Germany, a publicist from the "third emigration", suggests reconsidering this issue:

*The question that is usually bypassed when discussing the special role of Jews in Soviet society, despite its central character, is this: Is it correct to ascribe Jewish nationality to assimilated Jews who did not perceive themselves as Jews?*

*During the revolution, when Jews who had cut themselves off from Jewry came to power, national-Jewish thinkers emphasized that the revolutionaries were not "real" Jews or even traitors to the Jewish people. However, it was a defensive measure against accusations of responsibility for the Red Terror on the Jews. Simon Dubnov (...) considered these subtleties and subdivisions insignificant in comparison with the hatred of the population. In 1918, the Bolshevik Central Committee in Smolny was popularly called the "Jewish government". Dubnov bitterly entered this "joke" into his diary, fully realizing that it fully corresponds to the truth (...).*

*You cannot break with your people simply by your "desire" or "decision." One can perceive oneself as non-Jewish and yet belong to the Jewish tradition with everything with which it is connected (...).*

*When asked about his Jewishness, Trotsky answered: I am a Social Democrat and nothing else (...). Jews, who, like Trotsky, rejected Jewishness, did not want to understand that their type of "non-Jewishness" was typically Jewish (...). Isaac Deicher wrote: "The Jewish renegade who breaks with Jewry belongs to a very specific Jewish tradition."*

Some ideas, initially perceived in a religious form, can be absorbed by the people over the course of many generations, and then appear in descendants who have broken with religion - but in a different formulation. Thus, Kuprin, in a letter to Batyushkov, cited in Chapter 10, provides a direct "dictionary" for translating the same ideology from the language of the Old Testament into the language of modern emancipated Jewry. He says that the basic concept of contemporary progressive Jewry is only a translation into another language of the main provisions of the Orthodox Jewish tradition and brings them into the following table:

**Modern point of view**

**Traditional**

a / The Jewish people are the most talented, with the most aristocratic blood.

b / Historical conditions deprived him of statehood and

you have persecuted.

c / No persecutions crushed the Jews, and all the best is done and

will be done by the Jews.

a / The Jewish people are the "chosen" people of God and should not mix with anyone.

b / But God was angry with him for his sins and sent him trials among aliens,

c / But he will also send the Messiah and make the Jews rulers.

And S. Margolina writes:

*The Jew is not a fantastic invention. His self-perception begins with a sense of his "difference". First of all, this is due to the tradition of "being chosen", which, after the loss of religious content, was transformed into a feeling of superiority. That is, the Jew feels himself to be different not only because of his experience of contact with non-Jews, but also through the culturally transmitted goal-setting "to be something different and special."*

Or, Zinoviev in "History of the RCP (b)":

*They (the "economists") said: "What do you think the working class is the messiah"? To this we answered and we answer: the messiah, messianism is not our language, we do not like such words. But we accept the concept that is embedded in them: yes, in a certain sense the working class is the messiah and its role is messianic, for it is the class that will liberate the whole world.*

In this way, translated into another language, religious ideas can inspire and unite people who consider themselves atheists and materialists.

Rozanov argues that Jewry forms a closer community than national or religious:

*They are in essence **dear to each other**.*

This is how Gershenzon characterizes them:

*14 million people who feel like one family.*

And Rabbi Steinsaltz, in the article whose title we have adopted for this paragraph, offers his point of view: Jews are the "House of Jacob" or "House of Israel", this is a

family, that is, such a community from which it is impossible to leave, even declaring publicly his break with her.

And V. Toporov, as if "from within", describes the non-trivial nature of this "unity":

*Appearance, surname, family ties, subtle, but still quite definite features of national behavior distinguish ethnic Jews, mestizos and sometimes Quarterons (strong blood!); Among the identifying signs, it is undoubtedly necessary to name a painful reaction to the very formulation of the Jewish question, which is often inherent in people of non-Jewish origin, but who are married to a Jew or a Jewess, especially if they have children.*

Of course, in History people often united: in states, tribes, parties, different unions. But, starting from Antiquity, contemporaries (including those of Jewish origin) singled out Jewry as something different from other similar phenomena. Let me give you an analogy. An individual bee is, according to a number of characteristics, a rather primitively organized creature: for example, it cannot maintain a temperature different from that of the environment. But the bee hive has many of the characteristics of a much more highly organized being. For example, it maintains a constant temperature of  $+33 - +34^{\circ}\text{C}$  (in the part of the hive where eggs and larvae are located and during their rearing). Bees exchange food all the time (when the radioactive syrup gave less than 0.1%, soon 70% of all bees became radioactive). That is, the hive has an analogue of metabolism. Bees, waving their wings all the time, they create an air current - an analogue of breathing. Finally, the hive "reproduces" sexually: drones and uterus are similar in chromosomes to male and female reproductive cells. In view of a number of such properties, some entomologists believe that the functioning of the hive can be understood only by thinking of it as SUPERHORGANISM, the cells of which are individual bees. Note, however, that such a form of organization of life is found only among lower animals, and higher forms of life are associated with the development of various aspects of individuality and individual connections. that the functioning of the hive can only be understood by thinking of it as SUPERKHORGANISM, the cells of which are individual bees. Note, however, that such a form of organization of life is found only among lower animals, and higher forms of life are associated with the development of various aspects of individuality and individual connections. that the functioning of the hive can only be understood by thinking of it as SUPERKHORGANISM, the cells of which are individual bees. Note, however, that such a form of organization of life is found only among lower animals, and higher forms of life are associated with the development of various aspects of individuality and individual connections.

This is such a superorganism that arose in the form of Jewry. Its emergence took more than two millennia and included: the creation of the religious concept of the chosen people, the ideology of classical Judaism and the kagal organization, numerous Jewish organizations (such as the B'nai B'rith order) and other "closed" Jewish societies of the modern West.

In History, there are other human associations analogous to the superorganism. A striking example is Bolshevism, which is based on a "party of a new type." It is from Bolshevism that we have retained the most vivid description of this phenomenon "from within" - the testimony of the leading Bolshevik Pyatakov. This is his story (during a trip abroad) to his former party comrade, recorded and then published by the topic. Pyatakov emphasizes precisely the rejection of his individuality for the sake of merging with the party, the sacrifice of "pride, pride and everything else." He even declares that if the party recognizes as black what it sees as undoubtedly white, then he will force himself to think the same. He describes how painful this "self-abuse" is. Compared to this, "giving up life, shooting oneself with a revolver are sheer trifles." But everything is redeemed by an extraordinary sense of "honor and happiness" to be in the ranks of the party "making the impossible possible." (I gave the full text of Pyatakov's surviving story in my book on socialism.) And the parallelism here is not accidental: we are talking about spiritually related phenomena. If Shahak calls medieval Jewish communities, built like the kagals, "one of the most" closed "and totalitarian societies in all of human history," then it is not surprising that the spiritual tradition that developed there was indispensable for the creation of a totalitarian society of the 20th century. If Gershenzon writes that in Jewry the will of the people "had to permeate the personal will of every individual," then this reminds Pyatakov's words that the "ideological Bolshevik-Communist" would consider black what he sees as white.

It is thanks to these qualities of a "superorganism" created over several millennia that Jewish participation in the formation of a new "superorganism" is especially effective. We experienced this in the Russian revolution of 1917 and the decades that followed. When, for the most natural reasons, the number of Jews in the ruling stratum of society fell (only in comparison with the previous one, remaining significantly higher than the share in the population), then the communist government collapsed. Russia was subordinated to a different, capitalist - speculative way of life - and in this turn the Jewish influence proved to be just as dominant.

## **2. "The fate of the Jewish people".**

Rozanov, who thought a lot about the role of Jews in our life, wrote:

*I do not want to say about any other people that they have a "vocation", be it good or evil, light or darkness. The fact is in some specialization, in the existence of "exceptional abilities"; some "stand - point" in historical being, in psychology, in "mentality".*

Is it possible to deduce from the well-known history of how Jewry was formed - what is this "vocation"? After all, this is, in fact, the same as answering the question - what is the "meaning" or "purpose" of the history of the Jewish people. Questions such as "too vague" and "not meaningful" can be dismissed immediately. But the great composer - Shostakovich - wrote about the very area to which he devoted his life: "The meaning in music - this sounds unusual for many (...) But, despite their naivety and even rudeness, these questions are undoubtedly , have a right to exist. " Perhaps, then, this is also true

with regard to questions about meaning in History? And here it is difficult not to agree with Rozanov - if about any people, then, first of all, Jewish, such a question is justified by the whole history. Another thing, that these questions are extremely difficult. And Dostoevsky warned that for an answer to them "times and dates have not yet come." However, a lot has been written about this. And the very polyphony of opinions shows that there is no short and final answer. Of all that I know, the work of MO Gershenzon "The Fate of the Jewish People" made the deepest impression on me, and I took its title in the title of this paragraph. First of all, it was a stunning discovery for me: Gershenzon, the author and even the organizer of Vekh, a fine specialist in Russian literature, seemed to me an example of a completely assimilated Jew (and he wrote more than once "we, Russian intellectuals" ...); and here is such a passionate preoccupation with the fate of the Jewish people! And besides, the work is full of strong feeling and deep, persuasive thoughts. For example, Gershenzon's article in Vekhi makes much less impression. The author, apparently, feels the insolubility of the issue with the methods of rational thinking we are accustomed to, based on historical or sociological factors, therefore, he appeals rather to images and feelings.

Unfortunately, the volume of our work allows us to cite only some excerpts from Gershenzon's article. This is how the author characterizes this entire evolution as a whole:

*Thoughtful, complex plan - and elementary clarity of the plan; the main lines are so clear that a child can trace them; but each is determined by the most subtle considerations and serves the diverse tasks of the whole: such are the creations of a brilliant artist - and this is how the soul of the Jewish people created its external history.*

And in more detail, by stages:

*If you look closely, strange features are found in the rudiments of Jewry (...). The Jewish people firmly remembered one thing from their childhood: that their religion and laws were not formed in the usual way, not in the firm establishment of a settled way of life, but on the go, in motion.*

*It was a passionate, impatient will (...). Having rallied an indissoluble people from grains of sand, she immediately split it from the inside and then for centuries crushed it into pieces, ever smaller, until it sprayed at all. But the new atoms had to be of high quality, different from the original ones: the will of the people had to act in each of them. She had to penetrate the personal will of each individual so that he, fulfilling his egoistic desires, by the very nature of his desires and the way of their implementation would serve her goals.*

*The exile was necessary for the soul of the people; it will lift itself off the ground, pluck its roots.*

*Under Ezra and Nehemiah (...) Jewry became, as it were, one solid body, not fleshly - but spiritually, for all its atoms were now saturated with a single will.*

*The catastrophes of the 70th year, the final collapse of the Jewish kingdom, was not an external event, but the will of the Jewry itself, quite and deliberately*

*produced it in the material world with its own spiritual forces, at a time that it deemed timely.*

*The Jewish principle in the world has been simmering and filtering for over a thousand years; now it was finally ready: the strongest and purest infusion (...). Over the next centuries, the middle knot had to be tightened several times more so that the Jewish mind would not disintegrate in humanity; such was the creation of the Mishna in the 2nd and the Talmud in the 5th century, such was the rabbinic and kahal system.*

*In general, the goal has been achieved: Jewry has no earthly city.*

*For two thousand years, Jewry has managed to break the strongest chains with which a person is tied to the earth.*

*That is why, I think, the Jewish people have become a people of mobile professions, a people of crafts, trade, exchange. Agriculture is forbidden to the Jew by his folk spirit, because, penetrating into the earth, a person most easily grows to a place and to a stable form of life.*

*14 million people who feel like one family are scattered across 70 countries; a nation that had its own culture is internally dispersed over twenty foreign cultures; the people who have forgotten their native language and speak many foreign languages, the people are a chameleon, the people are a merchant, cut off from nature, withering in cities.*

The author also ponders over the tendency, which means, in a sense, over the purpose of this evolution. He emphasizes that she is far from painless, conflicting:

*Jewry was not a trifle for the world all these twenty centuries: the peoples followed it with burning interest and the further they looked, the brighter their gaze flared up with fear and hatred. In the work that a Jew does, there is some eternal truth, but how terrible.*

*The world thought that he would execute Jewry, but in fact served him, as he serves every will.*

*If it were not for religion, not the Torah and the consciousness of their community, the people would not have passed through such torments in a closed formation.*

*Here is the last immobility: for the believing Jew - the irreplaceable Torah and indecomposable Jewry; for the unbeliever, at least the latter.*

*Should I tell my foresight? But the facts themselves speak like an open book. I see that the mysterious will of the Jewish people is directed towards destroying this last stronghold (...).*

*It seems to me that Jewry is now entering the last stages of its path.*

*We can already predict with confidence: a person in Jewry will become poor in spirit; is it not for this goal that the whole of humanity is also striving.*

*They will be satiated with food that the world has not yet tasted, for all worldly values are like fake food.*

In the work of Gershenzon, strongly leaning towards the mystical side, several specific provisions can be distinguished that can be compared with the above historical material, and the facts of modern life.

1) Tireless, over the course of three millennia, the development of the solidarity of the Jewry, submission to his "one will": as "boiling and straining the infusion."

2) The same process, moving in one direction, characterized by the terms "separation from the earth", "separation from the roots", "Jewry (...) has no earthly city."

3) In such difficult conditions, unity is supported by religion (Torah, Halakha) and national self-awareness.

4) Foresight that these ties will be destroyed. At first glance, it sounds paradoxical: what then does Jewishness mean if we abandon these two principles of community - religion and nation? But after all, for example, Radzikhovsky numbers in Russia about 600 thousand Jews by passport and about three million "in the Jewish sphere." The number of mixed marriages among Jews is growing; now it already exceeds half of all marriages. So, maybe this is the fulfillment of the dream of the Assimilitzans: the Jews "dissolve" in the Russians? But Gershenzon understands it differently:

*The grain germinates - the husk should burst.*

He's writing:

*Who is a Jew. - In whom the popular power of Jewry operates (...),  
the national will acting in him will itself divert his steps to the proper path.*

Apparently, all over the world a layer has formed, consisting of orthodox and non-religious Jews, those who (according to Lenin's definition) "with an admixture of Jewish blood", members of their families and people who somehow adhere to Jewry, as people often cling to any authority.

How does this whole layer unite? Shahak points to the organizing center - Orthodox Jewry centered in Israel and Jewish national organizations in the diaspora (that is, around the world). He argues that Israel is controlled by the rabbinate and its policy is determined more, as he says, "Jewish ideology" than the geopolitical (albeit imperialist) interests of the country. But, he says:

*Besides Israel's politics, one might think that "Jewish ideology" affects significant groups, if not most of the Jews in the diaspora.*

This influence, especially in the United States, he says, is exercised through Jewish organizations of the "closed" (exclusive) type, which in principle do not allow non-Jewish members. And knowing how Jewry knows how to inspire *others* your point of view, to infect your mood, you can imagine how great the impact of radical, organized Jewry on

other Jews, their families and people close to them. For example, Israel is committing aggressive, terrorist acts against the Arabs, causing them extreme hatred. And then the Jews of the diaspora are intimidated by threats that if now they do not support the policy of Israel, then the Arabs there will slaughter all Jews, and perhaps Jewish pogroms will begin all over the world. I remember well how about 12 years ago a wave of fears of imminent pogroms arose in our country several times. And if the process itself was probably artificially organized, then the hysteria of fear was most likely sincere.

So, apparently, we are talking about the *power* (in our time - power over almost the whole world) of a certain stratum, in which the Jews (no matter how you understand this word) may not constitute the majority, but their participation is necessary for unity and legal capacity the whole layer. Why Gershenzon: a Russian intellectual, a connoisseur of Russian literature, a participant and even organizer of Vekhi; judging by many indications, he is not religious, let alone connected with any kagal, but he also clearly feels it:

*The Jewish principle is indestructible, insoluble by any reagents. The Jewish people can completely dissolve into the world - and I think it will - but the spirit of Jewry will only get stronger from this.*

Finally, how is one to understand the tendency of "detachment from the ground," "detachment from the roots," which Gershenzon constantly emphasizes? These words seem to be some kind of empty rhetoric (and in Gershenzon's article - an argument in the fight against Zionism, to which the article is largely devoted). However, they coincide with a trend that has driven the Western world over the past centuries. This is the creation of the so-called "technological civilization", which begins with the destruction of the peasantry as the main support of life and builds life that increasingly relies on technology, so that it is sometimes defined as the desire to destroy nature, replacing it with artificial nature with technology (but man is part of nature!). Now it is being proclaimed as the ideology of "post-industrial society", but it is being implemented as follows: that ten times more funds are invested in stock speculations than in the real economy. This economic policy is persistently pursued by the "Federal Reserve Fund" in charge of issuing US dollars. Its long-term chairs are Paul Volker and Allan Grinshpan. And the largest fortunes are now formed either on stock speculation or on the production of "virtual reality" objects. And our revolution of 1917 proclaimed "internationalism", that is, it broke with such "fake dishes" as homeland and patriotism. At the same time, they fought against the "bourgeois family." Yes, and the "sexual revolution" that raged in the West in the 1960s and 70s, set the same goal. And drug use was understood as a path to the destruction of the "bourgeois repressive individuality." And in the book of Jacques Attali, written 10 years ago, it is predicted that in the XXI century. the fate of humanity will be determined by a new generation of winners and losers:

*Having done away with any national "tie", breaking family ties, replacing all this with miniature microprocessors (...) consumers from privileged areas of the world will turn into "rich nomads".*



*Myriads of poor nomads will also arise.  
These impoverished pirates will cruise the planet in search of food and shelter.  
The feeling of attachment to the place that gave birth to all cultures will only turn  
into a faint, regrettable memory.*

And as a result:

*He (a person) with artificial organs inserted into him will become an artificial  
being himself, which can be bought or sold like any other object or product (...).  
Thus, he will join what ultimately goes back to the cult of industrial cannibalism.*

One could dismiss all this as frivolous rhetoric. But the author is a serious figure (from Algerian Jews. He was an economic adviser to President Mitterrand, then - the first president of the established International Monetary Fund). Apparently, he wants to convey some tendencies of the current ruling elite of the world. And an impressive coincidence even in terms - Gershenzon speaks about the Jewish religion and laws: "they were not formed in the usual way, not in the firm establishment of a settled way of life, but on the go, in motion"; Attali - about the future "civilization of nomads", "leading a sedentary lifestyle of society - only an intermediate stage between the two stages of nomadism."

If we admit that Gershenzon's opinion that the whole history of Jewry is permeated by the striving for "separation from the roots," "separation from the earth," then here, in this direction, it went ahead of mankind. Moreover, his idea was formulated by Gershenzon even when the prerequisites for a "post-industrial society" were only being formed.

Gershenzon argues that by developing this tendency, Jewry thereby helps to achieve "the goal towards which all mankind strives." It is difficult to establish whether all of it really strives for this, but such a current undoubtedly exists. Somewhat more specifically, he explains this position by the fact that as a result, "all worldly values" will become "like fake food." Perhaps this is the reason for all the conflicts between Jewry and other peoples, stretching throughout history. Other peoples do not just conservatively hold on to their "worldly values" - they feel that their loss is tantamount to the death of a people. Religion, national traditions, morality, family - constitute the "invisible body" of the people, without which its visible body perishes. Obviously, all the "ordinary" peoples that have existed until now (except, maybe Jewish) are not able to get enough of this "food that the world has not yet tasted" - according to Gershenzon's formulation. For them, their earthly values are not "fake food", but a condition without which they cannot exist.

At the same time, we saw what a colossal power the Jewry possesses and with what incredible energy it uses this power to impose the principles that it seeks to instill in the rest of humanity - be it a worldwide revolution or the domination of "world values" in a unified "new world".

In ch. 2 we quoted Gretz as saying that the mission of the Jews is to become teachers of all mankind. This point of view has been expressed many times. In relation to Russia, it was recently formulated by a Jewish poet:

*We are there, where we were not asked,  
But on a dark night before dawn  
We are the stepchildren of blind Russia  
And we are her guides.*

Such an attitude was, perhaps, the "common denominator" of all such heterogeneous conflicts in which Jewry was drawn in its history, and accusations of cruel usury, distillation and even a desire to lead revolutionary work or activities in the Cheka - GPU - NKVD - only by particular manifestations of this clash of worldviews.

### **3. Again the question of power.**

Even if we reread the previous chapters once again, it seems to me that one phenomenon will be striking first of all - the striking growth of the influence of Jewry throughout the world. American Duke writes that in patriotic circles in the United States, the local government is characterized as SOP - the Zionist occupation government. If this is the situation in the United States, then what can we say about the whole world to which they are now dictating their power? Therefore, it is hardly possible to navigate in the modern world situation if one avoids the most probably taboo question:

*Is there any reason to assert that there is now Jewish power over the world?*

It seems to me that such a question cannot be simply answered "yes" or "no." This, in fact, is the case with most questions of life. One late mathematician laughed at trying to get one of these two answers to any question: what if you were asked how old are you? - he said.

It seems to me that the situation in the world is now close to that which we discussed in Ch. 11. There we have already discussed the question: is it true that the first years after the 1917 revolution in Russia there was Jewish power? It seems to me that an interesting consideration on this topic is expressed by S. Semanov in a recent article. He says there is a widespread belief among French people that all Germans are blondes. In fact, it turns out that blondes among Germans are less than half. But still, the percentage of blondes among Germans is many times greater than among the French. So the misconception of the French reflects an objectively correct observation. The often expressed opinion that "Soviet power in the first two decades after the revolution was Jewish" also possesses the same degree of reliability, says Semanov. It seems to me that in all these cases we are talking about an *approximate* statement that neglects a number of details. So, we can examine a distant object in general outlines with the naked eye, or, if we need to see it in detail, through a telescope. From this point of view, there is probably nothing to blame the American Duke when he says that the power in Russia after the revolution belonged to the Jews -

even such a degree of approximation is enough for him. But it is important for a Russian to know his history in great detail, especially since now there is an opportunity for this.

The statement that now there is a power of "Jewry" over the whole world seems to me to be just as rough approximation to the truth. It reflects some important truth - that in several key areas of activity related to power: finance, the media, the political machine, Jews occupy an extremely influential place and, when they are in a uniform mood, they are able to play a *decisive* role. But this close-up vision ignores a number of important details. First of all, we are not talking about "the whole world": China is not subordinate to these forces, to a large extent - India. Not yet completely - Russia. Secondly, in no structure associated with power, Jews do not occupy *all* places. Jewish influence is effective precisely because it manifests itself in currents (whether it be the world proletarian revolution or the market economy and "world values") that capture many representatives of other peoples - Russians, Germans, Anglo-Saxons.

We are faced here with an unusual form of dominance or power. It differs, for example, from the power of the Arabs during the period of Muslim expansion (VII-VIII centuries). Then everything was clear. There was a clearly proclaimed ideology - Islam. The division into dominant and subordinate was equally clear (for example, taxes were paid only by conquered non-Muslims). Moreover, for some time this division was also ethnic - Muslims were mainly Arabs.

Many now feel that a new power has been established over much of the world: its opponents call it "mondialism" or "globalism" and it is tied to a dominant Jewish influence on the same scale as in Russia in the first decades of communist rule. As then, the most essential feature of the new government is that the Jewish influence in it is not reducible to the numbers expressing the Jewish presence. That is, it is felt that striking numbers can be established, but they are not the essence of the matter. Suppose there is a man with a very typical Jewish surname at the head of a World Bank. But it is not he who determines the bank's policy (at least, not alone). And the composition of the board of directors is much more difficult to find out, and it is quite possible that the Jews do not constitute the majority there. And after all, if necessary, it was possible to make some lord the head: they are especially suitable for this. Now there is no way to assess what percentage of places the Jewry occupies in the most important structures of world power, and there is no need for this: it is clear that the participation of this enzyme is necessary for the effective functioning of power. The question is not measured by numbers: in the human body, enzymes are present in fractions, measured in millionths of a gram, but their presence is absolutely necessary for the life of the body.

On the other hand, all this power does not act in the direction of satisfying the immediate, human interests of the bulk of the 14 or 15 million Jews in the world. I. Shahak, S. Margolina and others express the feelings of those who cannot live in a "closed" Jewish society, to be under constant pressure from their leadership and artificially maintained ancient fears and taboos. It has always been that way. Neither the Jewish revolutionaries in Russia, nor the Jewish bankers who supplied them with

money, took care of the fate of hundreds of thousands of Jews who would be ruined as a result of the revolution or killed in turmoil. Like the leaders of the Jewish organizations in the United States, who called for an economic war with Hitlerite Germany, kindled passions that led to terrorist attacks against German functionaries - apparently, even now they ignore the connection of this with the fact what they call the "Holocaust". I, at least, have never seen a discussion of the liability issue that arises here. After all, they knew who they were dealing with. And the "Kaufman Plan" or "Morgenthau Plan" could directly serve as a leaflet to excite the spirit of the "Sonderkommands".

I remember the first time, 30 years ago, I came across a similar attitude in one manuscript, which was then passed from hand to hand. The author, an extremely nationally oriented Jew, saw the future of the Jewish people in the development of the State of Israel based on the adoption of Christianity by an increasing number of Jews. Along the way, he mentioned the Jews who died from Nazi persecution, and raised the question - how should we treat them? The answer struck me: "They were hopeless for the creation of our new state. It was 'dry straw' that had to burn." I then gasped - after all, this was written by a Jewish nationalist! However, since then, such statements (and sometimes accusations of the Zionist leadership in such a point of view) have surfaced from time to time, as has the term "dry straw" itself. And the life of Jews under the rule of kagals, courts "

*The Talmud, which lies at the basis of the life of the Jews, even in ancient times divided them into two sharply differentiated estates - patricians and plebeians - and determined their relationship with special rules.*

Among these rules are such that the plebeian "is not privy to any secrets", it is "allowed to break like a fish", family ties with him are considered bestiality. All state duties are distributed by the patricians and fall on the plebeians.

Already in the post-war period (1960s), a researcher of Jewish origin, Anna Arend, in a book on the origins of totalitarianism, speaks of the special relationship between Jewry and power under the "old regime" (before the era of the French Revolution) in Europe. These relations were based, in her opinion, on the privileged position of the "chosen" Jews, ie. the top of the Jewish communities. They kept this position by hindering the modernization of the rest of the communities. A. Arend sees one of the reasons for anti-Jewish feelings ("anti-Semitism"), ultimately expressed in the actions of the Nazi authorities ("catastrophe"), in the fact that Jewish bankers continued to be almost the only support of power in the era of democratic revolutions.

*Thus, the question of the influence of "Jewishness" is not a national issue; it does not fit into the religious framework either. Ultimately, this is a question of power, and now we are talking about power over almost the entire world.*

The situation is in many respects similar to that which was in Russia after the 1917 revolution. The process of "globalization" is caused by deep historical reasons that are associated with the past of Western European peoples. But for its quick completion and

effective maintenance of the newly emerging power, the "enzyme" that "Jewry" gives is necessary.

#### 4. Notes for Russia.

More than for any other country, for Russia it is now obvious that it is necessary to develop a conscious, national attitude towards the phenomenon of "Jewry". In the 20th century, Russia experienced two catastrophes of a revolutionary nature: 1917 and the coup of the late 1980s-1990s, which together shook it so much that now its continued existence is in question. In both of these catastrophes, the Jewish part of the population of Russia played an enormous role. In both cases, the people were split - in 1917 into "whites" and "reds", in the 1990s - into "patriots" and "democrats." And in both cases, Jewry as a whole has definitely tied itself to one side: with a coup d'etat. This is a fundamental historical fact concerning both the Russian and the Jewish people.

I want to emphasize that when I talk about developing my conscious attitude towards Jewry, I do not mean at all that this will result in a "solution to the Jewish question" (in Russia). As Toporov says:

*the "final decision", forced deportation and other "delights" dreamed of by even very insignificant national radicals, are impracticable at least in practice.*

(According to his estimates, now in Russia the Nuremberg laws would apply to 10-15 million people.) Yes, the absurdity of such impulses has already been convincingly demonstrated by Hitler. In his speeches, such a formulation was encountered several times, but he, it seems, never said what he meant by this "decision". And it seems to me that in fact he did not have any definite idea. At one time he discussed the idea of evicting European Jews to Madagascar, but for this he did not have enough Madagascar (and much more). And most importantly, such a path disfigures the soul of the people who chose it, and the Russians will never find a response - "this has been scientifically proven," as Berezovsky said in an interview with Topol.

In addition, such a formulation generally seems to me dangerous in principle, since it masks an invisible logical trap. When they talk about the "solution" of some issue, they tacitly assume that such a "solution", at least in theory, exists, you just need to find it. And this is often far from obvious and sometimes simply incorrect. Mathematics, for example, knows many questions that have no solution: squaring a circle, trisecting an angle, etc. The proof of the absence of a solution to the question (with its exact formulation) is often even associated with great progress in science.

Here is an instructive example concerning precisely the question that interests us in this work. As mentioned in Chapter 4, at the beginning of the 19th century, during the reign of Paul I, Derzhavin was entrusted with investigating the causes of the plight of the peasants of Belarus (frequent famines). He concluded that, among several reasons, the economic activities of the Jews there played a large role. In the "Opinion" he submitted, he proposes a system of measures, such as: abolition of the power of the kagals and

the fees established by them; changing the Jewish education system; the abolition of early marriages among them; attraction of Jews to factory and handicraft work; creation of new factories; attracting them to agricultural work; resettlement. These proposals provoked vigorous resistance from the Kagals. Their actions are reflected in Brafman's book (docs 280-286).

*Saturday, 1st teber 5562 (1802), week in Mikkets department.*

*In an emergency meeting in the presence of the leaders of the cities and the entire kagal staff, it was decided due to unfavorable news from the capital - Petersburg - that the fate of all Jews has now been transferred to the hands of five dignitaries, who have been given full power to dispose of it at their discretion, we are the purpose of asking the Emperor, may his glory be exalted, so that we have no innovations. And since this business requires many expenses, it was decided by general agreement to establish a temporary interest rate, which should be introduced in the following order: 1) everyone must pay 0.5% of cash capital, goods and secured debts; 2) 0.25% of real estate; 3) owners are required to contribute 10% of annual income from houses and shops; 4) young couples living dependent on their parents - 1% of their entire fortune ...*

Derzhavin cites a rumor that reached him about this collection and that in this way it was supposed to collect 1 million rubles for "gifts". And now the system of measures, clearly thought out by Derzhavin, was transferred (already under Alexander I) to a committee where the majority were rich landowners (mostly Poles) who leased their lands to Jews. Alexander I was increasingly alienated from Derzhavin, and in the end he was dismissed from the post of minister, which he held, and the committee decided to leave everything as before.

Now it could be said that this was to be expected in advance. Then Derzhavin's naivety was understandable: it was a time when Russia included large masses of Jews in its population for only a few decades. The complexity and difficulty of the problem was not yet clear at that time. But we can see that this is a "question" that the Egyptian pharaohs, the Assyrian-Babylonian kings, the Roman emperors, the medieval kings, the Russian tsars, and Hitler tried to "solve". And all are equally unsuccessful. There are no signs that people have become so much wiser in the intervening time that they will now be able to "solve" this issue. It is more likely that he is among the "insoluble" - at least within the period of history that spans the last millennia.

Such a seemingly strange situation: there is a "question", but no "solutions". But, on the other hand, it is a fairly common life situation. For example, I am getting old - this is my "question". Does he have a "solution"? Apparently not (if we exclude the one used by Faust - to sign the contract in blood, to turn to the witch ...). But there are two lines of behavior here. I could ignore my "question", i.e. act like I'm staying young. It probably would have ended badly quickly. For example, I would go on an ascent, my head would spin, I would fall off and crash - and at the same time, maybe, I would also rip off the one with whom I was tied with one rope. Or I can be aware of my "question" and try to live with it, ie. take it into account in your behavior. Apparently

In any case, it seems quite obvious that no *emigration* will resolve the issue of Russian-Jewish relations. There is no country capable of accepting such a population - not only Israel, but also the United States is not capable of this. And there is no desire for such a large departure. It seems to me that A. Sevastyanov's point of view is quite justified (his arguments are given in Chapter 15), according to which influential Jewish circles no longer consider it an essential task for themselves to emigrate Jews from Russia to Israel. For example, S. Margolina wrote (in the early 1990s):

*Now the Exodus is taking place again, the size of the Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union leaves no doubt that we are talking about the liquidation of one of the largest centers of Jewry in modern history.*

And in the collection "The Russian Idea and the Jews" almost every article proclaims this Exodus, and one author even asks if this is not a sign of divine curse: "Behold, your house remains empty for you" !! Now, however, it is already clear that no "Exodus" threatens us (including the divine curse). And there are no reasons that could change this situation in the foreseeable future. Once Ahad-Haam wrote: "The Jewish masses are condemned to remain in the scattering." In the same way, Russians are "condemned" to live next to a large (one of the largest in the world) Jewish community in the next historical period, and it is "condemned" to live next to us. And only considering this fact, we can really plan our future.

Russians can certainly cooperate with Orthodox Judaists who are not going to leave Russia, and with those who set themselves the goal of moving to Israel, and with all other shades of "being in the Jewish sphere." They can cooperate in science, art, entrepreneurship, any work. Moreover, the Jews will be useful to Russia precisely because they are so different from other peoples. But one condition is a prerequisite for the existence of *any* people and sustainable life of his country. This condition consists in the fact that the power in the country that it constitutes, should, in the main, be in the hands of this people, should at least approximately reflect the ethnic composition of the country. Moreover, not only the pinnacle of state power: the head of state or government, but leadership at all levels and in all areas of activity - in politics, the media, culture, the dominant Church, economics, and (no matter how difficult it is) even in finance.

In the 20th century, Russia acquired such a wealth of experience, experienced, it seems, all known forms of government: unlimited monarchy, constitutional monarchy, totalitarian system and party democracy on the Western model. And everywhere we saw that there is a certain ruling stratum. And the function of this or that form of government is to ensure that this ruling stratum ensures the fulfillment of those most important requirements that the rest of the population imposes on life. Only representatives of the authorities, related by origin to the rest of the people, are able to feel what decisions can be made by the people as "their own". Only within this framework, decisions can be found in various ways: by voting, seizure of power, etc.

And if the situation remains like the one that Poplar draws (very schematically):

*we (in the context of the Jews) have all financial power, and the government consists of half-Jews Kiriyenko and Chubais,*

then such a power, even against its will, will push Russia in a catastrophic direction. The very principle of the connection between the people and the authorities is not mechanical. For its implementation, it is necessary that power in Russia be in Russian hands. Otherwise, the Russians will begin to die out even faster, they will cease to defend Russia, they will generally lose the sense of the connection between their fate and the fate of the country. Russia will collapse into the abyss of strife and foreign conquests, where many not only Russians, but also Jews will perish (and it may turn into a worldwide catastrophe). Carefully, it will not be possible to gradually turn Russia into a non-Russian one. After all, the Russians are not North American Indians. On the contrary, compared with Russians, Jewry is more archaic: it grows into modern life, relying on ancient concepts, partly Old Testament, partly Talmudic and post-Talmudic.

This, as it seems to me, is the main reason for the Russian crisis - that our power is not Russian, moreover, for almost a whole century. And even earlier, before the revolution, life was tilting more and more in this direction. The wording from Poplar's article that "we got real power in this country" is a very simplistic reflection of a complex picture. In reality, the power is international ("internationalist" - as before). In the elite of this power, Jewry is numerically, probably in the minority, but plays an extremely significant role due to the "mechanism of cohesion" that has developed in it and its identification with the government. Therefore, an understanding of its role is a necessary prerequisite for the preservation, under current conditions, of the Russian people.

This point of view seems especially obvious in modern Russia, where more than 80% of the population is Russian. On the other hand, we saw the catastrophic consequences of violation of the principle of kinship, national ties between the authorities and the people. Any revolution is a shock. But it is not necessarily associated with the destruction of entire strata of the population, the entire historical tradition. When the leadership in it turned out to be non-Russian with a huge bias, it led to a series of disasters. If the people had then the present experience, they could feel, by this very sign alone, that this is some kind of "not our" revolution, the Russians and Russia have nothing good to expect from it.

Thus, we can formulate the following provisions:

1. Russians live under one sky with an exceptionally strong, "passionate" "historical community", in a number of respects much stronger than many peoples. For example - with their many thousands of years of historical experience. Or a special "mechanism of rallying" developed over these millennia, a feeling - "like one family" in the words of Gershenzon and Rabbi Steinsaltz - to which we, Russians, are still very far away. One can only read with envy one of the commandments of a medieval rabbi given by Shahak:

*To love every Jew is to take care of him as of yourself.*



(True, in a form alien to Russians: "take care of him and his money, as of yourself and your own money.")

2. Coexistence in one country with an influential group that identifies with Jewry, or, in the terminology of L. Radzikhovsky, located "in the Jewish sphere" - this is the fate of Russians at the next stage of history.

3. We must live together, but this is a very difficult coexistence. For many Jews, life among Russians, in a country that is Russian in spirit, evokes fierce rejection. What is the basis for this rejection? What gave birth to Gershuni, Bogrov, Sverdlov, Frenkel? - It is difficult to understand, yes, maybe, and this is not the main thing now. It is more important to recognize this fact. Of course, this was not "inequality", not Jewish pogroms or the Beilis affair. Although this belief is deeply rooted in the Jewish community. But after all, starting from the middle of the XIX century. in Germany there were no restrictions for Jews. Germany was often cited as an example of a country where Jews have no claims to society - and was cited as an example of Russia. And nevertheless, as we have seen, the participation of Jews in the leadership of the German revolution of 1918-23. was almost more than in the Russian 1917

Weizmann's attitude towards Russia provides an example of this a priori rejection. So, he writes:

*I knew little about the pagans, but very early on they became for me symbols of evil forces with which I must fight, exerting all my young abilities in order to win my place in life.*

Indeed, he often speaks of his hatred for Russia, without even trying to explain it: "knowing about my hatred for Russia, he turned to me ..." and so on.

And we have met this radical rejection of the Russian system of life until recently (cf. Chapter 15).

Such a sad circumstance must be borne in mind, do not turn a blind eye to it. Apparently, there is something in Russians for a certain spiritual warehouse that is difficult to bear. But it is not for us, thanks to this, to break our national psyche. Those who are absolutely unbearable to live with us should, of course, be given the opportunity to leave - yes, there is such an opportunity now. With those who prefer to stay - find a form of coexistence. For them, as painless as possible, but above all assuming the preservation of the Russian national identity. After all, we simply cannot leave our country, but we, on a national scale, have nowhere to go.

4. For Russia to be viable, power in all areas of life and at all levels must be mainly Russian. And in the coming centuries, the most likely contender for power from the non-Russian side is the representatives of world Jewry (although not exclusively they). However, such a statement has nothing to do with any spirit of bitterness. The concept of "retaliation" is generally alien to Russian consciousness. In the Russian

mind, for example, the Mongol conquest was by no means imprinted as a "Holocaust." Here a condition is simply formulated - both logically quite obvious, and more than once confirmed by experience - for a normal, stable life of the people. Without which the whole of our country will not exist for a long time, and this will tragically hit all its inhabitants - including the Jews living here. And protests were heard repeatedly, precisely from the Jewish side,

There is already an old tradition of such "Jewish dissidence". It probably begins with the famous d, Acosta (17th century). Brafman, authors of the collection "Russia and the Jews", Anna Arndt. Already in the post-war period - S. Margolina. She writes, for example, about the tactlessness of modern Jews, who moan too loudly about the persecution they allegedly endure:

*Compared to the bloody clashes in Nagorno-Karabakh, by Uzbek children hanged and women torn to pieces, compared to Ossetian breastfeeding babies frozen in the snow, the Jewish question with smearing anti-Semitism and pogrom fantasies does not occupy a very prominent place.*

*The substantial moral capital acquired by the Jews in connection with Auschwitz appears to have been wasted.*

*The world also now has the right to treat Jews like all other peoples.*

*The fate of the Jews cannot be divorced from the fate of other peoples; the struggle for the rights of the Jews is no more progressive than the struggle for the rights of other peoples.*

Likewise, Toporov:

*And yet there is a certain national paranoia, forcing the Jews in every possible way to inflate a fleeting, already past or even imaginary danger, in the most pernicious way for themselves, neglecting in time the real danger.*

Finally, Shahak simply writes in despair about Israel's transformation into a totalitarian state:

*Historical Judaism and its two successors, Orthodox Judaism and Zionism, are both sworn enemies of the concept of an open society as applied to Israel.*

He calls for a reconsideration of the attitude to the "Jewish past", to recognize the existence of "Jewish exclusivity" and even suggests addressing, in relation to the ideology on which both are based, Voltaire's call: "Crush the reptile!"

It would be wonderful if some spiritual upheaval within the Jewish people eliminated the pressure of international Jewry that we have experienced over the past century: "going to power", treating our life values as "fake food". But no people can rely on the fact that the solution to their problems will come from outside. Therefore, hoping that the publicists known to us reflect the broad current of Jewish thought, Russians can, in matters concerning their future, rely only on their own strength.

5. Of course, in the current situation in Russia, it generally sounds bitter irony - to talk about some kind of Russian forces. But we must hope that the Russian people have not been killed by all the catastrophes they have experienced, but only knocked down and gradually come to their senses.

In addition, the main force that Russia is now oppressed by - the denationalized society of the West, international financial capital centered in the United States and with such weapons as NATO - is itself experiencing a deep crisis. The decline of spiritual creativity - both artistic and scientific - the decline in the role of national states, the growing sense of the "end", the threat of death - whether an atomic war, overpopulation or an ecological crisis - finally, a deep financial crisis and the growth of terrorism (and, perhaps, terrorism and there is an attempt to hide the financial crisis) - all these are signs of the end of the type of civilization that has developed in Western Europe and the United States. XXI century. will inevitably witness the fall of this civilizational type: an example of such a sudden collapse was the destruction of the Soviet Union. In my last work, I analyzed in detail the arguments, confirming the inevitability of this outcome. Then the burden pressing on Russia will be incomparably lessened and there will be a likely opportunity to determine their own destiny. It is this assumption that provides, in any case, the basis for the continuation of life and efforts:

*Even though the fight is unequal, the fight is hopeless.  
Above us the luminaries are silent in the sky,  
Below us are the graves - they are silent and ONE.*

The true tragedy of our history lies in the fact that by this moment, when physically we could determine our future, we may not be ready ideologically. That is why, as a prerequisite for the creation of Russian power, our first task should be set - *to defend our right to comprehend, discuss our fate and history...* To discuss freely, without making a reservation ten times that "although we are Russians, we are not chauvinists", without trying to balance each statement with another, softening it, without moving here like a soldier across a mined field, as a result of which the reader (and perhaps the author himself ) ceases to understand what, in fact, we are talking about. In one word - without an "internal censor" (not to mention an external one). After all, we belong in the mind of Homo sapiens and reason, the ability to discuss and understand, is one of the most powerful tools that a person has used during his entire existence. How can we demand that in an issue so important to our people, we abandon it or use it only within certain narrow limits?

6. But it is precisely in the issue discussed in this work that the pressure on human thought is especially strong - almost all over the world. It is here that the line of the struggle for freedom of thought now runs. The accusation of "anti-Semitism", about which one American publicist said: "Nobody knows what it is, but everyone knows that if you are accused of this, then expect big trouble" - is used, after all, most often precisely as a censorship argument.

Recently the whole situation has crystallized very clearly in one example. In connection with the published book by Solzhenitsyn on Russian-Jewish relations, the editor of the International Jewish Newspaper expressed disapproval:

*Today is not the time when the country needs another confrontation, which will not lead to anything positive, will only create another, this time a very dangerous knot.*

That is, in the words of Poplar:

*For the first time in a thousand years since the settlement of Jews in Russia, we have received real power in this country.*

And now it's "not the time when" it is worth remembering how it happened. A very clear idea was expressed and very reasonable - but from the point of view of Jewishness. From the Russian point of view, it is just as natural to try to understand how such a situation developed in order to change it and ensure that it will not happen again.

This motive sounds even clearer in response to the same book by the notorious Mark Deutsch:

*Why would a "living classic" need this shame, and even I would say, filthy - a hundred years later to find out in detail whether a newspaper report about the atrocities of the pogromists was exaggerated?*

At this point, the forbiddenness of an untouchable topic is directly expressed.

Indeed, crime is already on the first page of the book, where the author says:

*... I believe that this story - an attempt to delve into it - should not remain "forbidden".*

7. The question that we discussed in this work is very important for the Russian people. Finding the attitude towards it that corresponds to our national interests is a *necessary* condition for the further existence of Russia. But in mathematics, for example, necessary and sufficient conditions are clearly distinguished. And the development of the correct approach to the issue of Russian-Jewish relations is, of course, only *necessary* condition for the continued existence of Russia. Let us ensure that the power in Russia at different levels will be predominantly Russian. But where is the guarantee that she will find the right solution? After all, the Russian government can turn out to be corrupt, selfish or just stupid. And in our history we have seen a number of examples. For example, in the Time of Troubles, some boyars of the most ancient families called the Polish king to the Kremlin, while others rushed to bow to the Tushino thief. And the destructive impulses that led to the end of the revolution were the founders of the nobles of ancient families: Chaadaev, Bakunin, Herzen. And in the next

generation, those who developed the ideology of hostility to historical Russia - Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev - were undoubtedly Russian. As later many revolutionaries, even later - "democrats", were also Russian. Both the Provisional Government and the Gorbachev Politburo were Russian. And in our time, if the absence of a noticeable Jewish influence guaranteed adherence to Russian interests, then the modern communists would be the ideal party. And they, despite all the draperies, all the time make compromises at the expense of Russian interests: Crimea, Sevastopol, Transnistria, etc. And in general, apparently, it is wrong to see the cause of all the difficulties and misfortunes of people's life in *someone external* factor. So, Leo Tolstoy said more than once that the main cause of all troubles is private ownership of land. How lucky he was that he didn't live to see the 30s when it was canceled! Many anti-communists were less fortunate, who were sure that to eliminate the communist regime - and the rest would somehow work out. And many lived to the point that communism really disappeared - but life only got worse. You can find yourself in the same position if you now believe that the main and only cause of Russian catastrophes is the disproportionate Jewish influence on Russian history.

8. To develop an approach to Russian-Jewish relations that would correspond to Russian national interests is only a necessary condition for Russia to get out of the current crisis. *Only necessary - but vital...* Jewish influence on Russian history of the 20th century. was huge. This is a fact, in the words of Levin (in the collection *Russia and the Jews*), "unconditional, which must be explained, but it is useless and aimless to deny." Of course, it was not this influence that determined Russian history, but the tendencies that had already appeared in it gave a radical interpretation, often catastrophic for Russian fate. To assess Jewish influence, let's perform a "thought experiment" - suppose that, for some fantastic reason, Jews in the twentieth century. would not affect the life of Russia at all. Of course, all the same, Russia would have experienced a crisis at the beginning of the 20th century. But almost the entire financial base of the opposition press, and of most parties, would disappear. Of course, Ryabushinsky and Morozov would have given money anyway, but the scale would have been completely different. There would have been no leaders in the militant organization of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, there would have been no Bund, Plekhanov would have been almost alone at the head of the Social Democrats and would not have been able to create Bolshevism. The murder of Stolypin would not have taken place. We can say that there would be a Russian murderer - like Russian terrorists who attempted on him on Aptekarsky Island. But that attempt did not succeed - the performers, therefore, were not "capable" enough. It is useless to guess how our story would have gone, but it is clear that it would be otherwise. Perhaps the February revolution would have ended in nothing like the revolution of 1905; perhaps the forces of peasant uprisings and white armies would have won the Civil War; or collectivization would have failed. It can only be seen that history would have gone differently, and after all, a slight relief from the blows that fell on Russia was enough,

And the same "thought experiment" will give the same result in connection with the "second revolution" - the coup of the 1990s. It's not about the presidents of the USSR and Russia, who were obviously listening to some alien signals. But the mass of

politicians, administrators, financiers, mainly according to the list from the article "Jewish Happiness", propagandists who instantly turned from communists into democrats - created the effect of a real avalanche. And if the destruction of all life had not been so swift, the people, perhaps, would have had time to realize what is happening, to isolate some national forces from themselves.

Comparison of these two crises - 1917 and 1990s. - shows that we Russians are very slowly learning the lesson of history. True, the period dividing both crises was very unfavorable for us to realize our national destiny. But still, at least some representatives of the intelligentsia could convey a clearer vision to the people. But what to regret about the past! - it is dangerous that we may be just as unprepared for the next turn of history. To prevent even this from happening is a real task on which it is still possible - and therefore must - to work.

9. Many who have pondered Jewish history have come to the conclusion that they are dealing with a *riddle*. How can we be in the face of this riddle, while "all times and dates have not yet been fulfilled"? After all, we cannot simply ignore it, our life depends on it, and our very existence. In this case, three relationships are possible. The first is to ignore the problem itself, convince yourself that it does not exist. This is the worst way out. It was also tried under the communist regime, when in general they tried to solve the issue of interethnic relations by prohibiting its discussion (as, indeed, many other issues). The second approach is to try to *guess* a clue, how to jump over the abyss of ignorance that separates us from the answer. Several concepts arose in this way, of which the simplest is the concept of a Jewish conspiracy formed for three thousand years by a secret Jewish government. All such concepts have in common that they can neither be proven nor disproved, and they do not claim to be factual or logical. You can only believe in them or not believe in them. *Third* the approach is not to pretend to be a definitive answer, a "clue". But to collect the facts that can be extracted from the factual material accumulated over these three thousand years and formulate the conclusions that follow from them. And on this basis, try to find a certain line of behavior, although knowing that it is based on "incomplete information". Indeed, in life we never have "complete information". This principle is the basis of this work. He follows Goethe's thought:

*understand the understandable and calmly accept the incomprehensible.*

Life is full of mysteries - in mathematics, physics, biology, and history - especially in everything related to man. It takes a certain sense of humility to accept the fact that no one will find out the answer to most of them in the course of our lives.

## LITERATURE

Dostoevsky. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Steinsaltz. A. What is a Jew. "Window". 4-10 jan. 1996 or the Internet [http // www.vinnitsa.com / vinjew / 09 Ru 05.03.2002.page4](http://www.vinnitsa.com/vinjew/09_Ru_05.03.2002.page4).

Lurie S. Cit. in Ch. 2.

Weizmann Ch. Cit. in Ch. ten.

K. Marx and F. Engels. Compositions. Vol. 1. M. 1955.

Gefter M. Echo of the Holocaust and the Russian Jewish Question. M. 1995.

Goldmann N. Cit. in Ch. 3.

Margolina S. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Kuprin A. Cit. in Ch. ten.

Zinoviev G. Cit. in Ch. eleven.

Gershenzon M. Cit. in Chapter 1.

Attali J. On the threshold of the new millennium. M. 1993.

Chauvin R. From the bee to the gorilla. M. 1965.

Shafarevich I. Works. Vol. 1.

Rozanov V. Judaism. In the book. "The Mystery of Israel". Cit. in Chapter 1.

Shahak I. Cit. in Ch. 1.0

Moroz S. In the book. "The light is two-fold". M. 1996.

Semanov S. Russian-Jewish showdowns. M. 2001.

Duke D. Cit. in Chapter 1.

Poplar E. Cit. in Ch. 15.

Brafman Y. Cit. in Chapter 4.

Sevastyanov A. Cit. in Ch. 15.

"The Russian Idea and the Jews". Cit. in Ch. fourteen.

Shafarevich I. Spiritual foundations of the Russian crisis of the XX century. M. 2001.

"International Jewish Newspaper". N 32 (358), Aug. 2001.

Deich M. "Moskovsky Komsomolets". 11 Apr 2002.

<http://shafarevich.voskres.ru/index.htm#b15>